arXiv:1607.02922v1 [math.CO] 11 Jul 2016

Characterization and recognition of proper tagged probe interval graphs

Sourav Chakraborty[*], Shamik Ghosh[†‡], Sanchita Paul[§] and Malay Sen[¶]

July 12, 2016

Abstract

Interval graphs were used in the study of genomics by the famous molecular biologist Benzer. Later on probe interval graphs were introduced by Zhang as a generalization of interval graphs for the study of cosmid contig mapping of DNA.

A tagged probe interval graph (briefly, TPIG) is motivated by similar applications to genomics, where the set of vertices is partitioned into two sets, namely, probes and nonprobes and there is an interval on the real line corresponding to each vertex. The graph has an edge between two probe vertices if their corresponding intervals intersect, has an edge between a probe vertex and a nonprobe vertex if the interval corresponding to a nonprobe vertex contains at least one end point of the interval corresponding to a probe vertex and the set of non-probe vertices is an independent set. This class of graphs have been defined nearly two decades ago, but till today there is no known recognition algorithm for it.

In this paper, we consider a natural subclass of TPIG, namely, the class of *proper tagged probe interval graphs* (in short PTPIG). We present characterization and a linear time recognition algorithm for PTPIG. To obtain this characterization theorem we introduce a new concept called *canonical sequence* for proper interval graphs, which, we belief, has an independent interest in the study of proper interval graphs. Also to obtain the recognition algorithm for PTPIG, we introduce and solve a variation of consecutive 1's problem, namely, *oriented consecutive* 1*'s problem* and some variations of PQ-tree algorithm. We also discuss the interrelations between the classes of PTPIG and TPIG with probe interval graphs and probe proper interval graphs.

Keywords: Interval graph, proper interval graph, probe interval graph, probe proper interval graph, tagged probe interval graph, consecutive 1's property, PQ-tree algorithm.

[*]Chennai Mathematical Institute, Chennai, India. sourav@cmi.ac.in

[†]Department of Mathematics, Jadavpur University, Kolkata - 700 032, India. sghosh@math.jdvu.ac.in

[‡](Corresponding author)

[§]Department of Mathematics, Jadavpur University, Kolkata - 700 032, India. sanchitajumath@gmail.com

[¶]Department of Mathematics, North Bengal University, District - Darjeeling, West Bengal, Pin - 734 430, India. senmalay10@gmail.com

1 Introduction

A graph $G = (V, E)$ is an *interval graph* if one can map each vertex into an interval on the real line so that any two vertices are adjacent if and only if their corresponding intervals intersect. Such a mapping of vertices into an interval on the real line is called an *interval representation of* G. The study of interval graphs was motivated by the study of the famous molecular biologist Benzer [2] in 1959. Since then interval graphs has been widely used in molecular biology and genetics, particularly for DNA sequencing. Different variations of interval graphs have been used to model different scenarios arising in the area of DNA sequencing. Literature on the applications of different variations of interval graphs can be found in [5, 13, 22].

In an attempt to aid a problem called *cosmid contig mapping*, a particular component of the physical mapping of DNA, in 1998 Sheng, Wang and Zhang [34] defined a new class of graphs called *tagged probe interval graphs* (briefly, TPIG) which is a generalization of interval graphs. Since then one of the main open problems in this area has been "Given a graph G, recognizing whether G is a *tagged probe interval graphs*."

Definition 1.1. A graph $G = (V, E)$ is a *tagged probe interval graph* if the vertex set V can be partitioned into two disjoint sets P (called "probe vertices") and N (called "nonprobe vertices") and one can map each vertex into an interval on the real line (vertex $x \in V$ mapped to $I_x = [\ell_x, r_x]$) such that all the following conditions hold:

1. N is an independent set in G, i.e., there is no edge between nonprobe vertices.
2. If $x, y \in P$ then there is an edge between x and y if and only if $I_x \cap I_y \neq \emptyset$, or in other words the mapping is an interval representation of the subgraph of G induced by P.
3. If $x \in P$ and $y \in N$ then there is an edge between x and y if and only if the interval corresponding to the nonprobe vertex contains at least one end point of the interval corresponding to the probe vertex, i.e., either $\ell_x \in I_y$ or $r_x \in I_y$.

We call the collection $\{I_x \mid x \in V\}$ a *TPIG representation* of G. If the partition of the vertex set V into probe and nonprobe vertices is given, then we denote the graph as $G = (P, N, E)$.

Problem 1.2. Given a graph $G = (P, N, E)$, give a linear time algorithm for checking if G is a *tagged probe interval graph.*

Tagged probe inteval graphs have been defined nearly two decades ago and since then this problem has not seen much progress. Untill this paper there was no known algorithm for tagged probe

interval graphs or any natural subclass of tagged probe interval graphs, excepting probe proper interval graphs (cf. Subsection 1.2.3).

A natural and well studied subclass of interval graphs are the *proper interval graphs*. A *proper interval graph* G is an interval graph in which there is an interval representation of G such that no interval contains another properly. Such an interval representation is called a *proper interval representation of* G. Proper interval graphs is an extremely rich class of graphs and we have a number of different characterizations of proper interval graphs.

In this paper, we study a natural special case of tagged probe interval graphs which we call *proper tagged probe interval graph* (in short, *PTPIG*). The only extra condition that a PTPIG should satisfy over TPIG is that the mapping of the vertices into intervals on the real line that gives a TPIG representation of G should be a **proper interval representation** of the subgraph of G induced by P.

In this paper we present a linear time (linear in $(|V| + |E|)$ recognition algorithm for PTPIG. The backbone of our recognition algorithm is the characterization of proper tagged probe interval graphs that we obtain in Theorem 3.4. To obtain this characterization theorem we introduce a new concept called **"canonical sequence"** for proper interval graphs, which we believe would be of independent interest in the study of proper interval graphs. Also to obtain the recognition algorithm for PTPIG, we introduce and solve a variation of consecutive 1's problem, namely, *oriented consecutive* 1*'s problem*.

1.1 Notations

Suppose a graph G is a PTPIG (or TPIG), then we will assume that the vertex set is partitioned into two sets P (for probe vertices) and N (for nonprobe vertices). To indicate that the partition is known to us, we will sometimes denote G by $G = (P, N, E)$, where E is the edge set. We will denote by G_P the subgraph of G that is induced by the vertex set P. We will assume that there are p probe vertices $\{u_1, \ldots, u_p\}$ and q nonprobe vertices $\{w_1, \ldots, w_q\}$. To be consistent in our notation we will use i or i' or $i_1, i_2, \ldots$ as indices for probe vertices and use j or j' or $j_1, j_2, \ldots$ as indices for nonprobe vertices.

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph and $v \in V$. Then the set $N[v] = \{u \in V \mid u \text{ is adjacent to } v\} \cup \{v\}$ is the *closed neighborhood* of v in G. A graph G is called *reduced* if no two vertices have the same closed neighbourhood. If the graph is not reduced then we define an equivalence relation on the vertex set V such that v_i and v_j are equivalent if and only if v_i and v_j have the same (closed) neighbors

in V. Each equivalence class under this relation is called a *block* of G. For any vertex $v \in V$ we denote the equivalence class containing v by $B(v)$. Let the blocks of G be $B_1^G, B_2^G, \ldots, B_t^G$ (or sometimes just $B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_t$). So, the collection of blocks is a partition of V. The reduced graph of G (denoted by $\widetilde{G} = (\widetilde{V}, \widetilde{E})$) is the graph obtained by merging all the vertices that are in the same equivalence class.

If M is a $(0,1)$-matrix, then we say M satisfies the *consecutive 1's property* if in each row and column, 1's appear consecutively [17, 24]. We will denote by $A(G)$ the *augmented adjacency matrix* of the graph G, in which all the diagonal entries are 1 and non-diagonal elements are same as the adjacency matrix of G.

1.2 Background Materials

1.2.1 PQ-trees

In the past few decades many variations of interval graphs has been studied mostly in context of modeling different scenario arising from molecular biology and DNA sequencing. Understanding the structure and properties of these classes of graphs and designing efficient recognition algorithms are the central problems in this field. Many times this studies have led to nice combinatorial problems and development of important data structures.

For example, the original linear time recognition algorithm for interval graphs by Booth and Lueker [4] in 1976 is based on their complex PQ tree data structure (also see [3]). Habib et al. [14] in 2000 showed how to solve the problem more simply using lexicographic breadth-first search, based on the fact that a graph is an interval graph if and only if it is chordal and its complement is a comparability graph. A similar approach using a 6-sweep LexBFS algorithm is described in Corneil, Olariu and Stewart [8] in 2010.

In this paper we will be using the data structure of PQ-trees quite extensively. PQ-trees are not only used to check whether a given matrix satisfy the consecutive 1's property, they also store all the possible permutations such that if one permuted the rows (or column) using the permutations, the matrix would satisfy the consecutive 1's property. We define a generalization of the problem of checking consecutive 1's property to a problem called Oriented-consecutive 1's problem and show how the PQ-tree representation can be used to solve this problem also. Details are available in Section 4.

Index	Properties	References
1	G is a Proper Interval Graph.	[27, 28, 29, 30, 12]
2	G is a Unit Interval Graph	
3	G is *claw-free*, i.e., G does not contain $K_{1,3}$ as an induced subgraph.	
4	For all $v \in V$, elements of $N[v] = \{u \in V \mid uv \in E\} \cup \{v\}$ are consecutive for some ordering of V (closed neighborhood condition).	[6, 7, 8, 12]
5	There is an ordering $v_1, v_2, \cdots, v_n$ of V such that G has a proper interval graph representation $\{I_{v_i} = [a_i, b_i | i = 1, 2, \cdots, n\}$ where $a_1 < a_2 < \cdots < a_n$ and $b_1 < b_2 < \cdots < b_n$.	
6	There is an ordering of V such that the augmented adjacency matrix $A(G)$ of G satisfies the consecutive 1's property.	
7	*A* straight enumeration *of G is a linear ordering of blocks (vertices having same closed neighborhood) in G, such that for every block, the block and its neighboring blocks are consecutive in the ordering.* G has a straight enumeration which is unique up to reversal, if G is connected.	[9, 15, 16, 25]
8	*The* reduced graph $\widetilde{G}$ *is obtained from G by merging vertices having same closed neighborhood.* *$G(n, r)$ is a graph with n vertices $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n$ such that x_i is adjacent to x_j if and only if $0 < \|i - j\| \leqslant r$, where r is a positive integer.* $\widetilde{G}$ is an induced subgraph of $G(n, r)$ for some positive integers n, r with $n > r$.	[19]

Table 1: Characterizations of proper interval graphs: equivalent conditions on an interval graph $G = (V, E)$.

1.2.2 Proper Interval Graphs

For proper interval graphs we have a number of equivalent characterizations. Recall that a proper interval graph G is an interval graph in which there is an interval representation of G such that no interval contains another properly and such an interval representation is called a *proper interval representation* of G. It is important to note that a proper interval graph G may have an interval representation which is not proper. Linear-time recognition algorithms for proper interval graphs are obtained in [9, 10, 15, 16]. A *unit interval graph* is an interval graph in which there is an interval representation of G such that all intervals have the same length. Interestingly, these two concepts are equivalent. Another equivalence is that an interval graph is a proper interval graph if and only if it does not conatin $K_{1,3}$ as an induced subgraph. Apart from these, there are several other characterizations of proper interval graphs (see Table 1). Among them we repeatedly use the following equivalent conditions in the rest of the paper:

Theorem 1.3. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be an interval graph. then the following are equivalent:*

1. *G is a proper interval graph.*
2. *There is an ordering of V such that for all $v \in V$, elements of $N[v]$ are consecutive (the closed neighborhood condition).*
3. *There is an ordering of V such that the augmented adjacency matrix $A(G)$ of G satisfies the consecutive 1's property.*
4. *There is an ordering $\{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n\}$ of V such that G has a proper interval representation $\{I_{v_i} = [a_i, b_i] \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ where $a_i \neq b_j$ for all $i, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, $a_1 < a_2 < \cdots < a_n$ and $b_1 < b_2 < \cdots < b_n$.*

Remark 1.4. We note that in a proper interval graph $G = (V, E)$, the ordering of V that satisfies any one of the conditions (2), (3) and (4) in the above theorem also satisfies the other conditions among them.

1.2.3 Relation between PTPIG and other variants

A very similar definition to the TPIG is the class of graphs called probe interval graphs. A graph $G = (V, E)$ is a *probe interval graph* (in short, PIG) if the vertex set V can be partitioned into two disjoint sets probe vertices P and nonprobe vertices N and one can map each vertex into an interval on the real line (vertex $x \in V$ mapped to I_x) such that there is an edge between two vertices x and y if at least one of them is in P and their corresponding intervals I_x and I_y intersect. When

the interval representation is proper (i.e., no interval is properly contained in another interval) the graph is called a *probe proper interval graph* (briefly, PPIG). Clearly PPIG is a subclass of PIG. The concept of PIG was introduced by Zhang [37] in 1994 in an attempt to aid a problem called cosmid contig mapping. Recognition algorithms for PIG can be found in [18, 20, 21]. A characterization of probe interval graphs in terms of adjacency matrix was obtained in [11]. For more information about PIG, see [5, 13, 26, 22, 23]. Only recently, Nussbaum [25] presented the first recognition algorithms for PPIG.

While the definition of PIG is very similar to that of TPIG, the two classes of graphs are not comparable [34]. But PPIG is a proper subclass of PTPIG. In fact, since in an interval representation of PPIG, no interval contains other properly, there is an edge between a probe and nonprobe vertices if and only if an end point of the interval corresponding to the probe vertex belongs to the interval corresponding the nonprobe vertex.

On the other hand, $K_{1,3}$ with a single nonprobe at the center cannot be a PPIG for otherwise it would be a proper interval graph (as any probe interval graph with a single nonprobe vertex is an interval graph). But it is a PTPIG by choosing three disjoint intervals for probe vertices and an interval containing all of them corresponding to the nonprobe vertex. As $K_{1,3}$ is an interval graph, it is an example of PIG and PTPIG, but not a PPIG.

Similarly, C_4 with a single nonprobe vertex is a PTPIG with an interval representation $\{[1,3],[2,5],[4,6]\}$ for probes and $[3,4]$ for a nonprobe, but this is not a PIG (for otherwise it would be an interval graph). Now consider the graph G_1 in Figure 1. That G_1 is a PIG and TPIG follows from the interval representation described in Figure 2. But G_1 is not a PTPIG as the subgraph induced by probe vertices is $K_{1,3}$ which is not a proper interval graph.

1.3 Organization of the paper

The first section contains definitions, preliminaries and examples. Also we fix some notations in Subsebtion 1.1 which we will use for the rest of the paper. In section 2, we introduce the concepts



Figure 1: The graph G_1.



Figure 2: Interval representation of the graph G_1 in Figure 1.

of a canonical sequence of a proper interval graph and study the structural properties of the sequence. Section 3 contains the details of the graph class PTPIG. In this section we provide the main characterization theorem for PTPIG (cf. Theorem 3.4) with illustrative examples and more structural properties of the canonical sequence in context of a PTPIG which are used to develop the recognition algorithm presented in the next section. In Section 4, a linear time recognition algorithm for PTPIG is obtained gradually special to the most general case in three subsections. We put some concluding remarks and bibliography at the end of the paper.

2 Canonical Sequence of Proper Interval Graphs

Let G be a proper interval graph. Then there is an ordering of V that satisfies conditions (2), (3) and (4) of Theorem 1.3. Henceforth we call such an ordering, a *natural* or *canonical* ordering of V. But this canonical ordering is not unique. A proper interval graph may have more than one canonical orderings of its vertices. Interestingly, it follows from Corollary 2.5 of [9] (also see [25]) that the canonical ordering is unique up to reversal for a connected reduced proper interval graph.

Definition 2.1. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a proper interval graph. Let $\{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n\}$ be a canonical ordering of the set V with the interval representation be $\{I_{v_i} = [a_i, b_i] \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ where $a_i \neq b_j$ for all $i, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, $a_1 < a_2 < \cdots < a_n$ and $b_1 < b_2 < \cdots < b_n$. Now we combine all a_i and b_i $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, n)$ in an increasing sequence which we call the *interval canonical sequence* with respect to the canonical ordering of vertices of G and is denoted by $\mathcal{I}_G$.

Now if we replace a_i or b_i by i for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$ in $\mathcal{I}_G$, then we obtain a sequence of integers belonging to $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ each occurring twice. We call such a sequence a *canonical sequence* of G with respect to the canonical ordering of vertices of G and is denoted by $\mathcal{S}_G$. Moreover, if we replace i by v_i for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$ in $\mathcal{S}_G$, then the resulting sequence is called a *vertex canonical sequence* of G (corresponding to the canonical sequence $\mathcal{S}_G$) and is denoted by $\mathcal{V}_G$.

Note that $\mathcal{S}_G$ and its corresponding $\mathcal{V}_G$ and $\mathcal{I}_G$ can all be obtained uniquely from each other. Thus by abuse of notations, sometimes we will use the term canonical sequence to mean any of these.

		$[2,4]$	$[3,9]$	$[6,12]$	$[7,14]$	$[8,17]$	$[10,20]$	$[16,24]$	$[22,28]$
		v_1	v_2	v_3	v_4	v_5	v_6	v_7	v_8
$[2,4]$	v_1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
$[3,9]$	v_2	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
$[6,12]$	v_3	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
$[7,14]$	v_4	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
$[8,17]$	v_5	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
$[10,20]$	v_6	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0
$[16,24]$	v_7	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
$[22,28]$	v_8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

Table 2: The augmented adjacency matrix $A(G)$ of the graph G in Example 2.2

2.1 Example of Canonical Sequence

Example 2.2. Consider the proper interval graph $G = (V, E)$ whose augmented adjacency matrix $A(G)$ along with a proper interval representation is given in Table 2. Note that vertices of G are arranged in a canonical ordering as $A(G)$ that satisfies the consecutive 1's property. Let $[a_i, b_i]$ be the interval corresponding to the vertex v_i for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, 8$. Then

a_1	a_2	a_3	a_4	a_5	a_6	a_7	a_8
2	3	6	7	8	10	16	22
b_1	b_2	b_3	b_4	b_5	b_6	b_7	b_8
4	9	12	14	17	20	24	28

Then the interval canonical sequence combining a_i and b_i is given by

$$\mathcal{I}_G = (a_1, a_2, b_1, a_3, a_4, a_5, b_2, a_6, b_3, b_4, a_7, b_5, b_6, a_8, b_7, b_8).$$

Therefore the canonical sequence and the vertex canonical sequence with respect to the given canonical vertex ordering is

$\mathcal{S}_G = (1\ 2\ 1\ 3\ 4\ 5\ 2\ 6\ 3\ 4\ 7\ 5\ 6\ 8\ 7\ 8)$ and $\mathcal{V}_G = (v_1\ v_2\ v_1\ v_3\ v_4\ v_5\ v_2\ v_6\ v_3\ v_4\ v_7\ v_5\ v_6\ v_8\ v_7\ v_8)$.

2.2 Structure of the Canonical Sequence for Proper Interval Graphs

If a graph G is a reduced proper interval graph then the following lemma states that the canonical sequence for G is unique upto reversal.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a proper interval graph and $V = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n\}$ be a canonical ordering of vertices of G. Then the canonical sequence $\mathcal{S}_G$ is independent of proper interval representations that satisfies the given canonical ordering. Moreover $\mathcal{S}_G$ is unique up to reversal for connected reduced proper interval graphs.*

	v_1	v_2	v_3	v_4	v_5	v_6	v_7	v_8
v_1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
v_2	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
v_3	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
v_4	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
v_5	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
v_6	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0
v_7	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
v_8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

Table 3: The matrix $A(G)$ of the graph G in Example 2.2 with its stair partition.

Proof. Let $\{I_{v_i} = [a_i, b_i] \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ and $\{J_{v_i} = [c_i, d_i] \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ be two proper interval representations of G that satisfy the given canonical ordering. Now for any $i < j$, $a_j < b_i$ if and only if v_i is adjacent to v_j if and only if $c_j < d_i$. Thus the canonical sequence $\mathcal{S}_G$ is independent of proper interval graph representations. Now since the canonical ordering is unique up to reversal for a connected reduced proper interval graph, the canonical sequence $\mathcal{S}_G$ is unique up to reversal for connected reduced proper interval graphs. □

Now there is an alternative way to get the canonical sequence directly from the augmented adjacency matrix. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a proper interval graph with $V = \{v_i \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ and $A(G)$ be the augmented adjacency matrix of G with consecutive 1's property. We partition positions of $A(G)$ into two sets (L, U) by drawing a polygonal path from the upper left corner to the lower right corner such that the set L [resp. U] is closed under leftward or downward [respectively, rightward or upward] movement (called a *stair partition* [1, 31, 32]) and U contains precisely all the zeros right to the principal diagonal of $A(G)$ (see Table 3). This is possible due to the consecutive 1's property of $A(G)$. Now we obtain a sequence of positive integers belonging to $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, each occurs exactly twice, by writing the row or column numbers as they appear along the stair. We call this sequence, the *stair sequence* of $A(G)$ (see Table 4) and note that it is same as the canonical sequence of G with respect to the given canonical ordering of vertices of G.

Proposition 2.4. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a proper interval graph with a canonical ordering $V = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n\}$ of vertices of G. Let $A(G)$ be the augmented adjacency matrix of G arranging vertices in the same order as in the canonical ordering. Then the canonical sequence $\mathcal{S}_G$ of G is the same as the stair sequence of $A(G)$.*

Proof. We show that the stair sequence is a canonical sequence for some proper interval representation and so the proof follows by the uniqueness mentioned in Lemma 2.3. Given the



Table 4: The stair sequence (1 2 1 3 4 5 2 6 3 4 7 5 6 8 7 8) of $A(G)$ of the graph G in Example 2.2.

matrix $A(G)$, a proper interval representation of G is obtained as follows. Let $a_i = i$ and $b_i = U(i) + 1 - \frac{1}{i}$ where $U(i) = \max\{j \mid j \geq i \text{ and } v_iv_j = 1 \text{ in } A(G)\}$ for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. Then $\{I_{v_i} = [a_i, b_i] \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ is a proper interval representation of G. [9, 15] If $U(1) > 1$, to make all the end points distinct, we slightly increase the value of b_1 (which is the only integer valued right end point and is equal to $a_{U(1)}$) so that it is still less than its nearest end point which is greater than it. Now we get a proper interval representation of G that satisfies the condition 4 of Theorem 1.3. Then the canonical sequence merges with the stair sequence for this proper interval representation of G as for $i < j$, $a_j = j < b_i$ if and only if $v_iv_j = 1$ if and only if the column number j appears before the row number i in the stair sequence. □

Corollary 2.5. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a connected proper interval graph. Then $\mathcal{S}_G$ is unique up to reversal.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.3, the result is true if G is reduced. Suppose G is not reduced and $\widetilde{G} = (\widetilde{V}, \widetilde{E})$ be the reduced graph of G having vertices $\tilde{v_1}, \ldots, \tilde{v_t}$ corresponding to the blocks $B_1, \ldots, B_t$ of G. Now $\widetilde{G}$ has unique canonical ordering of vertices up to reversal. Consider any of these orderings. When blocks of G are arranged according to this order in its augmented adjacency matrix $A(G)$, we have same rows (and hence same columns) for vertices in the same block. Thus permutation of vertices within the same block does not change the matrix. Let $b_i = |B_i|$ for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, t$. Then considering the stair sequences of G and $\widetilde{G}$, it is clear that $\mathcal{S}_G$ is obtained uniquely from $\mathcal{S}_{\widetilde{G}}$ by replacing each i by the subsequence

$$(\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} b_j + 1, \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} b_j + 2, \ldots, \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} b_j + b_i)$$

irrespective of the permutations of vertices within a block. □



Figure 3: The graph G_b and its TPIG representation [34]

Remark 2.6. Let G be a connected proper interval graph which is not reduced and $\widetilde{G}$ be the reduced graph of G. Then the graph $\widetilde{G}$ has a unique (upto reversal) canonical ordering of vertices, say, $b_1, \ldots, b_t$ (corresponding to the blocks $B_1, \ldots, B_t$) as it is connected and reduced. Now the canonical orderings of the vertices of G are obtained from this ordering (and its reversal) by all possible permutation of the vertices of G within each block. In all such cases $\mathcal{S}_G$ will remain same up to reversal.

3 Structure of PTPIG

Let us recall the definition of proper tagged probe interval graph.

Definition 3.1. A tagged probe interval graph $G = (P, N, E)$ is a *proper tagged probe interval graph* (briefly PTPIG) if G has a TPIG representation $\{I_x \mid x \in P \cup N\}$ such that $\{I_p \mid p \in P\}$ is a proper interval representation of G_P. We call such an interval representation a *PTPIG representation* of G.

It is interesting to note that there are examples of $TPIG$, G for which G_P is a proper interval graph but G is not a $PTPIG$. For example, the graph G_b (see Figure 3) in [34] is a TPIG in which $(G_b)_P$ consists of a path of length 4 along with 2 isolated vertices which is a proper interval graph. But G_b has no TPIG representation with a proper interval representation of $(G_b)_P$.

Now let us consider a graph $G = (V, E)$, in general, with an independent set N and $P = V \setminus N$ such that the subgraph G_P of G induced by P is a proper interval graph. Let us order the vertices of P in a canonical ordering. Now the adjacency matrix of G looks like the following:

	P	N
P	$A(P)$	$A(P, N)$
N	$A(P, N)^T$	$\mathbf{0}$

Note that the (augmented) adjacency matrix $A(P)$ of G_P satisfies the consecutive 1's property and the $P \times N$ submatrix $A(P, N)$ of the adjacency matrix of G represents edges between probe vertices and nonprobe vertices. In the following lemma we obtain a necessary condition for a PTPIG.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $G = (P, N, E)$ be a PTPIG. Then for any canonical ordering of the vertices belonging to P each column of $A(P, N)$ can not have more than two consecutive stretches of 1's.*

Proof. Let us prove by contradiction. Consider a canonical ordering of vertices belonging to P, say, $\{u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_m\}$. Let w_j be a vertex in N such that in the matrix $A(P, N)$ the column corresponding to w_j has at least three consecutive stretches of 1's. That is, there are five vertices in P, say $u_{i_1}, u_{i_2}, u_{i_3}, u_{i_4}$ and u_{i_5} (with $i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, i_5 \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$) such that $i_1 < i_2 < i_3 < i_4 < i_5$ and u_{i_1}, u_{i_3} and u_{i_5} are neighbors of w_j while u_{i_2} and u_{i_4} are not neighbors of w_j. Now let us prove its impossibility. We prove it case by case.

Let the interval corresponding to the vertex v_{i_k} be $I_{v_{i_k}} = [\ell_k, r_k]$ for $k = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$ in a PTPIG representation. Now by Theorem 1.3, we have $\ell_1 < \ell_2 < \ell_3 < \ell_4 < \ell_5$ and $r_1 < r_2 < r_3 < r_4 < r_5$. Since G is a PTPIG either $\ell_i \in I_{w_j}$ or $r_i \in I_{w_j}$ for each $j = 1, 3, 5$.

Case 1 **($\ell_1, \ell_5 \in I_{w_j}$):** In this case, for t such that $i_1 \leq t \leq i_5$, we have $\ell_t \in I_{w_j}$. In particular we have ℓ_2 and ℓ_4 are in I_{w_j}, i.e., u_{i_2} and u_{i_4} are neighbors of w_j which is a contradiction.

Case 2 **($r_1, r_5 \in I_{w_j}$):** In this case, for all t such that $i_1 \leq t \leq i_5$, we have $r_t \in I_{w_j}$. And again here we have a contradiction just like the previous case.

Case 3 **($\ell_1, r_5 \in I_{w_j}$ but $r_1, \ell_5 \notin I_{w_j}$):** Let I_{w_j} be $[\ell_{w_j}, r_{w_j}]$. So in this case, $a_5 < \ell_{w_j} \leqslant a_1$ which is a contradiction.

Case 4 **($r_1, \ell_5 \in I_{w_j}$):** If $\ell_3 \in I_{w_j}$, then $\ell_t \in I_{w_j}$ for all $t \in \{i_3, \ldots, i_5$ and this would mean that $\ell_4 \in I_{w_j}$ which is a contradiction. Similarly, if $r_3 \in I_{w_j}$, then $r_t \in I_{w_j}$ for all $t \in \{i_1, \ldots, i_3\}$ and then $r_2 \in I_{w_j}$ which also gives a contradiction.

Note that all the cases are taken care of and thus each column of $A(P, N)$ can not have more than two consecutive stretches of 1's. □

Unfortunately the condition in the above lemma is not sufficient as the following example shows. For convenience, we say an interval $I_p = [a, b]$ *contains strongly* an interval $I_n = [c, d]$ if $a < c \leqslant d < b$, where $p \in P$ and $n \in N$.[1]

[1] In [36], Sheng et al. used the term "contains properly" in this case. Here we consider a different term in order to avoid confusion with the definition of proper interval graph. Note that if $a \leqslant c \leqslant d < b$ or $a < c \leqslant d \leqslant b$, then also I_p contains I_n properly, but not strongly.

	p_1	p_2	p_3	p_4	p_5	p_6
p_1	1	1	0	0	0	0
p_2	1	1	1	1	0	0
p_3	0	1	1	1	0	0
p_4	0	1	1	1	1	0
p_5	0	0	0	1	1	1
p_6	0	0	0	0	1	1

	n_1	n_2
p_1	0	0
p_2	1	0
p_3	0	0
p_4	1	1
p_5	1	1
p_6	0	1

Table 5: The matrix $A(P)$ (left) and $A(P, N)$ (right) of the graph G in Example 3.3

Example 3.3. Consider the graph $G = (V, E)$ with an independent set $N = \{n_1, n_2\}$ and $P = V \setminus N = \{p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_6\}$, where the matrices $A(P)$ and $A(P, N)$ are given in Table 5. We note that $A(P)$ satisfies consecutive 1's property. So G_P is a proper interval graph by Theorem 1.3. Also note that G_P is connected and reduced. Thus the given ordering and its reversal are the only canonical ordering of vertices of G_P by Lemma 2.3. Suppose G is a PTPIG with an interval representation $\{I_x \mid x \in V\}$, where $I_{p_i} = [a_i, b_i]$ and $I_{n_1} = [c, d]$ such that $a_1 < a_2 < \cdots < a_6$ and $b_1 < b_2 < \cdots < b_6$.

Since $p_2 n_1 = 1$, we have either $a_2 \in [c, d]$ or $b_2 \in [c, d]$. Let $a_2 \in [c, d]$. Now $a_4 \in [c, d]$ implies $a_3 \in [c, d]$. But $p_3 n_1 = 0$, which is a contradiction. Thus $b_4 \in [c, d]$ and $a_4 \notin [c, d]$. But then we have $a_4 < c \leqslant a_2$ as $a_4 < b_4$, which is again a contradiction. Again $b_2, b_4 \in [c, d]$ would imply $b_3 \in [c, d]$ and consequently $p_3 n_1 = 1$. Thus we must have $b_2, a_4 \in [c, d]$ and $[a_3, b_3]$ contains $[c, d]$ strongly as $a_2 < a_3 < a_4$ and $b_2 < b_3 < b_4$. Again $p_5 n_1 = 1$ implies $[c, d] \cap \{a_5, b_5\} \neq \emptyset$. But $p_3 p_5 = 0$ which implies $[a_3, b_3] \cap [a_5, b_5] = \emptyset$. Thus $a_3 < b_3 < a_5 < b_5$ as $a_3 < a_5$. But then $[c, d] \cap \{a_5, b_5\} = \emptyset$ (as $[c, d] \subsetneqq [a_3, b_3]$) which is a contradiction. Similar contradiction would arise if one considers the reverse ordering of vertices of G_P. Therefore G is not a PTPIG, though each column of $A(P, N)$ does not have more than two consecutive stretches of 1's.

The following is a characterization theorem for a PTPIG. For convenience, henceforth, a continuous stretch (subsequence) in a canonical sequence will be called a *substring*.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with an independent set N and $P = V \setminus N$ such that G_P, the subgraph induced by P is a proper interval graph. Then G is a proper tagged probe interval graph with probes P and nonprobes N if and only if there is a canonical ordering of vertices belonging to P such that the following condition holds:*

(A) *for every nonprobe vertex $w \in N$, there is a substring in the canonical sequence with respect to the canonical ordering such that all the vertices in the substring are neighbors of w and all the neighbors of w are present at least once in the substring.*

Proof. Necessary condition: Let $G = (V, E)$ be a PTPIG with probes P and nonprobes N such that $V = P \cup N$. Let $\{I_x = [\ell_x, r_x] \mid x \in V\}$ be a PTPIG representation of G such that $\{I_u \mid u \in P\}$ be a proper interval representation of G_P. Then a probe vertex $u \in P$ is adjacent to $w \in N$ if and only if $\ell_u \in I_w$ or $r_u \in I_w$. Let $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_p$ be a canonical ordering of vertices in P that satisfies the conditions of Theorem 1.3. Now consider the corresponding canonical sequence $\mathcal{S}_{G_P}$, i.e., the combined increasing sequence of ℓ_{u_i} and r_{u_i} for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, p$. Since the sequence is increasing and I_w is an interval all the ℓ_{u_i}'s and r_{u_i}'s which are belonging to I_w occur consecutively in that sequence. Thus for any $w \in N$ there exists a substring of $\mathcal{S}_{G_P}$ such that all the vertices in the substring are neighbors of w and all the neighbors of w are present at least once in the substring.

Sufficiency condition: Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with an independent set N and $P = V \setminus N$ such that G_P, the subgraph induced by P is a proper interval graph, $P = \{u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_p\}$ and $N = \{w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_q\}$. Suppose there is a canonical ordering $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_p$ of vertices belonging to P such that for any nonprobe veretex $w \in N$, there is a substring in the canonical sequence $S = \mathcal{S}_{G_P}$ with respect to this canonical ordering such that all the vertices in the substring are neighbors of w and all the neighbors of w are present at least once in the substring. Let us count the positions of each element in S from 1 to $2p$. Now for each probe vertex u_i, we assign the closed interval $[\ell_{u_i}, r_{u_i}]$ such that ℓ_{u_i} and r_{u_i} are position numbers of first and second occurrences of i in S respectively. By definition of a canonical sequence, we have $\ell_{u_1} < \ell_{u_2} < \cdots < \ell_{u_p}$ and $r_{u_1} < r_{u_2} < \cdots < r_{u_p}$. Also since all position numbers are distinct, $\ell_{u_i} \neq r_{u_j}$ for all $i, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, p\}$. Thus this interval representation obeys the given canonical ordering of vertices belonging to P and by construction the canonical sequence with respect to it is same as S.

We show that this interval representation is indeed an interval representation of G_P which is proper. Let $i < j$, $i, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, p\}$. Then $\ell_{u_i} < \ell_{u_j}$ and $r_{u_i} < r_{u_j}$. Thus none of $[\ell_{u_i}, r_{u_i}]$ and $[\ell_{u_j}, r_{u_j}]$ contains other properly. Now u_i is adjacent to u_j in G_P if and only if $u_i u_j = 1$ in $A(P)$ when vertices of $A(P)$ are arranged as in the given canonical ordering. Again $u_i u_j = 1$ with $i < j$ if and only if j is lying between two occurrences of i in the stair sequence of $A(P)$ and hence in S by Proposition 2.4. Also since $i < j$, the second occurrence of j is always after the second occurrence of i in S. Thus $u_i u_j = 1$ with $i < j$ if and only if $\ell_{u_j} \in [\ell_{u_i}, r_{u_i}]$. This completes the verification that $\{[\ell_{u_i}, r_{u_i}] \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, p\}$ is a proper interval representation of G_P and that corresponds to S.

Next for each $j = 1, 2, \ldots, q$, consider the substring in the canonical sequence S such that all the vertices in the substring are neighbors of w_j and all the neighbors of w_j are present at least once in the substring. Let the substring start at ℓ_{w_j} and end at r_{w_j} in S. Then we assign the interval

$[\ell_{w_j}, r_{w_j}]$ to the vertex w_j. If w_j is an isolated vertex, then we assign a closed interval whose end points are greater than ℓ_{u_i} and r_{u_i} for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, p$. Now all we need to show is that $\{[\ell_{u_i}, r_{u_i}] \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, p\} \cup \{[\ell_{w_j}, r_{w_j}] \mid j = 1, 2, \ldots, q\}$ is a PTPIG representation of G, i.e., if u_i is a probe vertex and w_j is a nonprobe vertex then there is an edge between them if and only if either $\ell_{u_i} \in [\ell_{w_j}, r_{w_j}]$ or $r_{u_i} \in [\ell_{w_j}, r_{w_j}]$.

First let us assume that there is an edge between u_i and w_j. So the vertex u_i must be present in the substring of S that contains all the neighbors of w_j and contains only the neighbors of w_j. Since ℓ_{w_j} and r_{w_j} are the beginning and ending positions of the substring respectively, either ℓ_{u_i} or r_{u_i} must be in the interval $[\ell_{w_j}, r_{w_j}]$. Conversely, let either $\ell_{u_i} \in [\ell_{w_j}, r_{w_j}]$ or $r_{u_i} \in [\ell_{w_j}, r_{w_j}]$. Then we have either ℓ_{u_i} or r_{u_i} must be present in the substring. Since the substring contains vertices that are neighbors of w_j, we have u_i must be a neighbor of w_j. □

Remark 3.5. If G is a PTPIG such that G_P is connected and reduced, then there is a unique (up to reversal) canonical ordering of vertices belonging to P, as we mentioned at the beginning of Section 2. Thus the corresponding canonical sequence is also unique up to reversal. Also if condition (A) holds for a canonical sequence, it also holds for its reversal. Thus in this case condition (A) holds for **any** canonical ordering of vertices belonging to P.

	p_1	p_2	p_3	p_4	p_5	p_6	p_7	p_8
p_1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
p_2	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
p_3	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
p_4	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
p_5	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
p_6	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0
p_7	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
p_8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

	n_1	n_2	n_3	n_4	n_5	n_6
p_1	0	0	0	1	0	1
p_2	1	1	0	1	0	1
p_3	0	1	0	1	0	1
p_4	0	1	1	1	0	1
p_5	1	1	1	1	0	1
p_6	1	1	1	1	0	1
p_7	0	0	1	0	0	1
p_8	0	0	1	0	0	1

Table 6: The matrix $A(P)$ and $A(P, N)$ of the graph G in Example 3.6

Let us illustrate the above theorem by the following example.

Example 3.6. Consider the graph $G = (V, E)$ with an independent set $N = \{n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_6\}$ and $P = V \setminus N = \{p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_8\}$, where the matrices $A(P)$ and $A(P, N)$ are given in Table 6. First note that $A(P)$ satisfies consecutive 1's property. So G_P is a proper interval graph. Secondly, each column of $A(P, N)$ does not have more than two consecutive stretches of 1's. Now

the $S = \mathcal{S}_{G_P} = (1\ 2\ 1\ 3\ 4\ 5\ 2\ 6\ 3\ 4\ 7\ 5\ 6\ 8\ 7\ 8)$. The required substrings of probe neighbors for nonprobe vertices $n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_6$ are (5 2 6), (3 4 5 2 6 3 4), (4 7 5 6 8 7 8), (1 2 1 3 4 5 2 6 3 4), $\emptyset$, S respectively. Note that G is indeed a PTPIG with an interval representation shown in Table 7 which is constructed by the method described in the sufficiency part of Theorem 3.4.

Now consider the graph G in Example 3.3 which is not a PTPIG. From Table 5 we compute $S = S(G_P) = (1\ 2\ 1\ 3\ 4\ 2\ 3\ 5\ 4\ 6\ 5\ 6)$. The graph G_P is connected and reduced. So S is unique up to reversal. Note that the nonprobe vertex n_1 is adjacent to probe vertices $\{p_2, p_4, p_5\}$ and there is no substring in S containing only $\{2, 4, 5\}$.

Definition 3.7. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with an independent set N and $P = V \setminus N$ such that G_P, the subgraph induced by P is a proper interval graph. Let $\mathcal{S}_{G_P}$ be a canonical sequence of G_P. Let $w \in N$. If there exists a substring in $\mathcal{S}_{G_P}$ which contains all the neighbors of w and all the vertices in the substring are neighbors of w then we call the substring a *perfect substring of w in G*. If the canonical sequence $\mathcal{S}_{G_P}$ contains a *perfect substring of w in $\mathcal{S}_{G_P}$* for all $w \in N$, we call it a *perfect canonical sequence for G*.

Proposition 3.8. *Let $G = (P, N, E)$ be a PTPIG such that G_P is a connected reduced proper interval graph and $\mathcal{S}_{G_P}$ be a canonical sequence of G_P. Then for any nonprobe vertex $w \in N$, there cannot exist more than one disjoint perfect substrings of w in $\mathcal{S}_{G_P}$, unless the substring consists of a single element.*

Proof. Let $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_p$ be the canonical ordering of the probe vertices of G with the proper interval representation $\{[\ell_i, r_i] \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, p\}$ that satisfies the condition 4 of Theorem 1.3 and S be the corresponding canonical sequence $\mathcal{S}_{G_P}$. We first note that, since each vertex in S appears twice, there cannot be more than two disjoint perfect substrings of S.

Now suppose there is a nonprobe vertex, say, w in G such that there are two disjoint perfect substrings of length greater than 1. We will refer to these substrings as the first substring and

		[1, 3]	[2, 7]	[4, 9]	[5, 10]	[6, 12]	[8, 13]	[11, 15]	[14, 16]	[6, 8]	[4, 10]	[10, 16]	[1, 10]	[17, 17]	[1, 16]
		p_1	p_2	p_3	p_4	p_5	p_6	p_7	p_8	n_1	n_2	n_3	n_4	n_5	n_6
[1, 3]	p_1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
[2, 7]	p_2	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1
[4, 9]	p_3	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
[5, 10]	p_4	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1
[6, 12]	p_5	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1
[8, 13]	p_6	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1
[11, 15]	p_7	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
[14, 16]	p_8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1

Table 7: A proper tagged probe interval representation of the graph G in Example 3.6

second substring corresponding to the relative location of the substrings in S. Now in S, each number i appears twice due to l_i and r_i only. Thus if we think of the canonical sequence as an ordering of ℓ_i's and r_i's, then we have that the first substring contains all the ℓ_i's and the second substring contains all the r_i's for all the probe vertices u_i those are neighbors of w, as $\ell_i < r_i$ and both substrings contain all numbers i such that u_i is a neighbor of w.

Moreover due to the increasing order of ℓ_i's and r_i's, both the substrings contain numbers $k, k+1, \ldots, k+r$ for some integers k, r with $1 \leqslant k \leqslant m$ and $1 \leqslant r \leqslant m-k$. So the first substring must comprise of some consecutive collection of ℓ_i and similarly for the second substring, i.e., the first substring is $\ell_k, \ell_{k+1}, \ldots, \ell_{k+r}$ and the second substring is $r_k, r_{k+1}, \ldots, r_{k+r}$ (in $\mathcal{I}_{G_P}$). Therefore the vertices $u_k, \ldots, u_{k+r}$ form a clique.

Now suppose u_i is adjacent to u_{k+t} for some $i < k$ and $1 \leq t \leq r$. Then $\ell_i < \ell_k$ and $\ell_{k+r} < r_i$ as ℓ_k to ℓ_{k+r} are consecutive in the first substring (in $\mathcal{I}_{G_P}$). But this implies u_i is adjacent to all $u_k, u_{k+1}, \ldots, u_{k+r}$. Similarly, one can show that if u_j is adjacent to u_{k+t} for some $j > k+r$ and $1 \leq t \leq r$. Then u_j is adjacent to all $u_k, u_{k+1}, \ldots, u_{k+r}$. Thus (closed) neighbors of $u_k, u_{k+1}, \ldots, u_{k+r}$ are same in G_P which contradicts the assumption that G_P is reduced as $r \geq 1$. □

In fact, we can go one step more in understanding the structure of a PTPIG. If G is a PTPIG, not only there cannot be two disjoint perfect substrings (of length more than 1) for any nonprobe vertex in any canonical sequence but also any two perfect substrings for the same vertex must intersect at atleast two places, except two trivial cases.

Lemma 3.9. *Let $G = (P, N, E)$ be a PTPIG such that G_P is a connected reduced proper interval graph with a canonical ordering of vertices $\{u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_p\}$ and let $\mathcal{V}_{G_P}$ be the corresponding vertex canonical sequence of G_P. Let $w \in N$ be such that w has at least two neighbors in P and T_1 and T_2 be two perfect substrings for w in $\mathcal{V}_{G_P}$ intersecting in exactly one place. Then one of the following holds:*

1. *$\mathcal{V}_{G_P}$ begins with $u_1u_2u_1$ and only u_1 and u_2 are neighbors of w.*
2. *$\mathcal{V}_{G_P}$ ends with $u_pu_{p-1}u_p$ and only u_{p-1} and u_p are neighbors of w.*

Proof. Let $[a_i, b_i]$ be the interval corresponding to u_i for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, p$. Let the place where T_1 and T_2 intersect be the first occurrence of the vertex u_k.

Without loss of generality, let the substring T_1 end with the first occurrence of u_k and the substring T_2 start with the first occurrence of u_k. Thus for all $i > k$, the vertex u_i cannot appear before the

first occurrence of u_k in the $\mathcal{V}_{G_P}$. So T_1 does not contain any u_i such that $i > k$. Thus w is not a neighbor of any u_i such that $i > k$. Note that, it also means that for any vertex in the neighbor of w (except for u_k) the substring T_1 contains the first occurrence, while the substring T_2 contains the second occurrence. Thus the vertices in the neighborhood of w has to be consecutive vertices in the canonical ordering of G_P. Let the vertices in the neighborhood of w be $u_{k-r}, \ldots, u_{k-1}, u_k$, where $1 \leq r \leq k-1$.

Now for any vertex u_i such that $i < k - r$, we have u_i is not in T_1 and T_2. So the first occurrence of u_i is before the first occurrence of u_{k-r} and the second occurrence of u_i is either also before the first occurrence of u_{k-r} or after T_2, i.e., after the second occurrence of u_{k-r}. But if the second case happens, then we would violate the fact that G_P is proper. So the only option is that both the first and second occurrence of u_i is before the first occurrence of u_{k-r} and this would violate the condition that the graph G_P is connected. So the only option is there exists no u_i such that $i < k - r$. So $k - r = 1$. Thus we have the neighbors of w precisely $u_1, \ldots, u_k$.

Now if we look at the interval canonical sequence of G_P, we have T_1 corresponds to $a_1, \ldots, a_k$ and T_2 corresponds to $a_k, b_1, \ldots, b_{k-1}$. But this would mean that all the vertices $u_1, \ldots, u_{k-1}$ have the same (closed) neighborhood in G_P which is not possible as we assumed G_P is reduced, unless the set $\{u_1, \ldots, u_{k-1}\}$ is a single element set. In that case, w has neighbors u_1 and u_2 and the T_1 and T_2 correspond to a_1, a_2 and a_2, b_1 respectively (in $\mathcal{I}_{G_P}$). This is the first option in the Lemma. By similar argument, if we assume that T_1 and T_2 intersect in the second occurrence of the vertex u_k, we get the other option. □

Now let us consider what happens when the graph G_P induced by the probe vertices is not necessarily reduced. Let the blocks of G_P be $B_1, \ldots, B_t$. Then a canonical ordering of vertices in the reduced graph $\widetilde{G_P}$ can be considered as a *canonical ordering of blocks* of G_P and the corresponding canonical sequence $\mathcal{S}_{\widetilde{G_P}}$ can be considered as a *canonical sequence of blocks* of G_P. Then a substring in $\mathcal{S}_{\widetilde{G_P}}$ can also be called as a *block substring*. If there is a vertex in a block B_j that is a neighbor of a nonprobe vertex w, we call B_j a *block-neighbor* of w. Also if a block substring contains all the block neighbors of w and all the blocks in it are block-neighbors of w, then we call the block substring a *perfect block substring of w in $\mathcal{S}_{\widetilde{G_P}}$*. Then the following corollaries are immediate from Proposition 3.8 and Lemma 3.9.

Corollary 3.10. *Let $G = (P, N, E)$ be a PTPIG such that G_P is a connected proper interval graph. Let $\mathcal{S}_{\widetilde{G_P}}$ be a canonical sequence for the reduced graph $\widetilde{G_P}$. Then for any $w \in N$, there cannot exist more than one disjoint perfect block substrings of w in $\mathcal{S}_{\widetilde{G_P}}$, unless the block substring consists of a single element.*

Corollary 3.11. *Let $G = (P, N, E)$ be a PTPIG such that G_P is a connected proper interval graph with a canonical ordering of blocks $\{B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_t\}$ and let $\mathcal{V}_{\widetilde{G_P}}$ be the corresponding vertex canonical sequence of blocks of G_P. Let $w \in N$ be such that w has at least two block-neighbors in G_P and T_1 and T_2 be two perfect block substrings for w in $\mathcal{V}_{\widetilde{G_P}}$ intersecting in exactly one place. Then one of the following holds:*

1. *$\mathcal{V}_{\widetilde{G_P}}$ begins with $B_1B_2B_1$ and only B_1 and B_2 are block-neighbors of w.*
2. *$\mathcal{V}_{\widetilde{G_P}}$ ends with $B_tB_{t-1}B_t$ and only B_{t-1} and B_t are block-neighbors of w.*

4 Recognition algorithm

In this section, we present a linear time recognition algorithm for PTPIG. That is, given a graph $G = (V, E)$, and a partition of the vertex set into N and $P = V \setminus N$ we can check, in time $O(|V| + |E|)$, if the graph $G(P, N, E)$ is a PTPIG. Now $G = (P, N, E)$ is a PTPIG if and only if it a TPIG, i.e., it satisfies the three conditions in Definition 1.1 and G_P is a proper interval graph for a TPIG representation of G. Note that it is easy to check in linear time if the graph G satisfies the first condition, namely, if N is an independent set in the graph. Now for testing if the graph satisfies the other two properties we will use the characterization we obtained in Theorem 3.4.

We will use the recognition algorithm for proper interval graph $H = (V', E')$ given by Booth and Lueker [4] as a blackbox that runs in $O(|V'| + |E'|)$. The main idea of their algorithm is that H is a proper interval graph if and only if the adjacency matrix of the graph satisfies the consecutive 1's property. In other words, H is a proper interval graph if and only if there is an ordering of the vertices of H such that for any vertices v in H, the neighbors of v must be consecutive in that ordering. So for every vertex v in H they consider restrictions, on the ordering of the vertices, of the form "all vertices in the neighborhood of v must be consecutive". This is done using the data structure of PQ-trees. The PQ-tree helps to store all the possible orderings that respect all these kind of restrictions. It is important to note that all the orderings that satisfy all the restrictions are precisely all the canonical orderings of vertices of H.

The main idea of our recognition algorithm is that if the graph $G = (P, N, E)$ is PTPIG then, from Condition **(A)** in Theorem 3.4, we can obtain a series of restrictions on the ordering of vertices that also can be "stored" using the PQ-tree data structure. These restrictions are on and above the restrictions that we need to ensure the graph G_P is a proper interval graph. If finally there exists any ordering of the vertices that satisfy all the restrictions, then that ordering will be a canonical ordering that satisfies the condition **(A)** in Theorem 3.4. So the main challenge is to identify all

the extra restrictions on the ordering and how to store them in the PQ-tree.

Once we have verified that the graph $G = (P, N, E)$ satisfies the first condition in Definition 3.1 and we have stored all the possible canonical ordering of the vertices of the subgraph $G_P = (P, E_1)$ of G induced by P in a PQ-tree (in $O(|P| + |E_1|)$ time), we proceed to find the extra restrictions that is necessary to be applied on the orderings. We present our algorithm in three steps - each step handling a class of graphs that is a generalization of the class of graphs handled in the previous one.

STEP I: First we consider the case when G_P is a connected reduced proper interval graph.

STEP II: Next we consider the case when G_P is a connected proper interval graph, but not necessarily reduced.

STEP III: Finally we consider the general case when the graph G_P is a proper interval graph, but may not be connected or reduced.

For all the steps we will assume that the vertices in P are $v_1, \ldots, v_p$, the vertices in N are $w_1, \ldots, w_q$ and A_j be the adjacency list of the vertex w_j and let d_j be the degree of the vertex w_j. So the neighbors of w_j are $A_i[1], A_i[2], \ldots, A_j[d_j]$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, q$.

4.1 Step I: The graph G_P is a connected reduced proper interval graph

By Lemma 2.3, there is a unique (upto reversal) canonical ordering of the vertices of G_P. By Theorem 3.4, we know that the graph G is PTPIG if and only if the following condition is satisfied:

Condition (A1): For all $1 \leq j \leq q$, there is a substring in $\mathcal{S}_{G_P}$ where only the neighbors of w_j appear and all the neighbors of w_j appears at least once.

In this case, when the graph G_P is connected reduced proper interval graph, since there is a unique canonical ordering of the vertices, all we have to do is to check if the corresponding canonical sequence satisfies the Condition (A1). So the rest of the algorithm in this case is to check if the property is satisfied.

Idea of the algorithm: Since we know the canonical sequence $\mathcal{S}_{G_P}$ (or obtain by using known algorithms described before in $O(|P| + |E_1|)$ time, where E_1 is the set of edges between probe vertices), we can have two look up tables L and R such that for any vertex $v_i \in P$, the $L(v_i)$ and $R(v_i)$ has the index of the first and the second appearance of v_i in $\mathcal{S}_{G_P}$ respectively. We can obtain the look up tables in time $O(|P|)$ steps.

Also by $\mathcal{S}_{G_P}[k_1, k_2]$ (where $1 \leq k_1 \leq k_2 \leq 2p$) we will denote the substring of the canonical sequence sequence $\mathcal{S}_{G_P}$ that start at the k_1^{th} position and ends at the k_2^{th} position in $\mathcal{S}_{G_P}$.

To check the Condition (A1), we will go over all the $w_j \in N$. For $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, q\}$, let $L(A_j[1]) = \ell_j$ and $R(A_j[1]) = r_j$. Now since all the neighbors of w_j has to be in a substring, there must be a substring of length at least d_j and at most $2d_j$ (as each number appears twice) in $\mathcal{S}_{G_P}[\ell_j - 2d_j, \ell_j + 2d_j]$ or $\mathcal{S}_{G_P}[r_j - 2d_j, r_j + 2d_j]$ which contains only and all the neighbors of w_j. We can identify all such possible substrings by first marking the positions in $\mathcal{S}_{G_P}[\ell_j - 2d_j, \ell_j + 2d_j]$ and $\mathcal{S}_{G_P}[r_j - 2d_j, r_j + 2d_j]$ those are neighbors of w_j and then by doing a double pass (Algorithm 1), we find all the possible substrings of length greater than or equal to d_j in $\mathcal{S}_{G_P}[\ell_j - 2d_j, \ell_j + 2d_j]$ and $\mathcal{S}_{G_P}[r_j - 2d_j, r_j + 2d_j]$ that contains only neighbors of w_j.

We prove the correctness and run-time of the algorithm in the following theorem:

Theorem 4.1. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with an independent set N and $P = V \setminus N$ such that G_P is a connected reduced proper interval graph. Then Algorithm 2 correctly decides whether G is a PTPIG with probes P and nonprobes N in time $O(|P| + |N| + |E_2|)$, where E_2 is the set of edges between probes P and nonprobes N.*

Proof. For each $j = 1, 2, \ldots, q$, we test the Condition (A1). In Line 3, ℓ and r are the first and second appearance of the first probe neighbor of w_j respectively. In Lines 4–9, we generate two $(0, 1)$ arrays X and Y, each of length $4d_j+1$. The probe neighbors of w_j lying between $[\ell-2d_j, \ell+2d_j]$ are marked 1 in X with positions translated by $2d_j + 1 - \ell$. Similarly Y is formed by marking 1 for the probe neighbors of w_j lying between $[r-2d_j, r+2d_j]$ and translated by $2d_j+1-r$. Translations are required to avoid occurrence of a negative position. Then using Algorithm 1 we find all substrings of probe neighbors of length greater than or equal to d_j in Lines 10 and 15. Finally, in Lines 12–13 and 17–18, we check that whether the substring contains all probe neighbors of w_j. Thus by Theorem 3.4 and Remark 3.5, Algorithm 2 correctly decides whether G is a PTPIG with probes P and nonprobes N by testing that whether the Condition A1 is satisfied.

Now we compute the running time. For each $j = 1, 2, \ldots, q$, Algorithm 1 requires $O(d_j)$ time. Also Lines 4–9, 12 and 17 of Algorithm 2 require $O(d_j)$ time. Other steps require constant times. Thus Algorithms 1 and 2 run in $O(|E_2| + |N|)$ times, where E_2 is the set of edges between probes P and nonprobes N and the look up tables L and R were obtained in $O(|P|)$ time. Thus the total running time is $O(|P| + |N| + |E_2|)$. □

Algorithm 1: Finding-1Subsequence

Input : An array $A[1,T]$ containing only 0/1 entries, d (Assume $A[T+1]=0$).

Output : Output all (s,t) pairs such that $t-s \geq d$ and for all $s \leq i \leq t$, $A[i]=1$, (either $s=1$ or $A[s-1]=0$) and (either $t=T$ or $A[t+1]=0$).

```
Initialize ℓ = r = 0 while r ≤ T do
    if A[r+1] = 1 then
        r = r + 1
    if A[r+1] = 0 then
        if r − ℓ ≥ d then
            Output (ℓ+1, r)
        ℓ = r + 1
        r = r + 1
```

Algorithm 2: Testing Condition (A1)

Input : Given a graph $G=(V,E)$

Output : Accept if the **Condition (A1)** is satisfied

```
for j ← 1 to q do
    Initialize two arrays X and Y of length 4d_j + 1 by setting all the entries to 0.
    Let ℓ = L(A_j[1]) and r = R(A_j[1]).
    for each k ← 1 to d_j do
        Let s = L(A_j[k]) and t = R(A_j[k])
        If (ℓ − 2d_j ≤ s ≤ ℓ + 2d_j) Mark X[s − ℓ + 2d_j + 1] = 1
        If (ℓ − 2d_j ≤ t ≤ ℓ + 2d_j) Mark X[t − ℓ + 2d_j + 1] = 1
        If (r − 2d_j ≤ s ≤ r + 2d_j) Mark Y[s − r + 2d_j + 1] = 1
        If (r − 2d_j ≤ t ≤ r + 2d_j) Mark Y[t − r + 2d_j + 1] = 1
    for all (a,b) output of Finding-1Subsequence(X, d_j) do
        Let â = a + ℓ − 2d_j − 1 and b̂ = b + ℓ − 2d_j − 1.
        if ∀1 ≤ k ≤ d_j either â ≤ L(A_j[k]) ≤ b̂ or â ≤ R(A_j[k]) ≤ b̂ then
            j = j + 1
            Go To Step 1
    for all (a,b) output of Finding-1Subsequence(Y, d_j) do
        Let â = a + r − 2d_j − 1 and b̂ = b + r − 2d_j − 1.
        if ∀1 ≤ k ≤ d_j either â ≤ L(A_j[k]) ≤ b̂ or â ≤ R(A_j[k]) ≤ b̂ then
            j = j + 1
            Go To Step 1
    REJECT
ACCEPT
```

Remark 4.2. Since given a graph $G=(V,E)$ with an independent set N and $P=V \setminus N$, the checking whether $G_P=(P,E_1)$ is a proper interval graph and obtaining $\mathcal{S}_{G_P}$ (from any proper interval representation of G_P) requires $O(|P|+|E_1|)$ time, the total recognition time is $O(|P|+|N|+|E_1|+|E_2|)=O(|V|+|E|)$.

4.2 Step II: The graph G_P is a connected (not necessarily reduced) proper interval graph

In this case, that is when the graph G_P is not reduced, we cannot say that there exists a unique canonical ordering of the vertices of G_P. So by Theorem 3.4, all we can say is that among the set of canonical orderings of the vertices of G_P, is there an ordering such that the corresponding canonical sequence satisfies Condition (A) of Theorem 3.4? As mentioned before we will assume that we have all the possible canonical ordering of the vertices of G_P stored in a PQ-tree. Now we will impose more constraints on the orderings so that the required condition is satisfied.

Let $\widetilde{G_P}$ be the reduced graph of G_P. By Remark 2.6, $\widetilde{G_P}$ has a unique (upto reversal) canonical ordering of vertices, say, $b_1, \ldots, b_t$ (corresponding to the blocks $B_1, \ldots, B_t$ of the vertices of G_P) and the canonical orderings of the vertices of G_P are obtained by all possible permutations of the vertices of G within each block.

Since we know the canonical sequence $\mathcal{S}_{\widetilde{G_P}}$ for the vertices in $\widetilde{G_P}$, we can have two look up tables L and R such that for any vertex $b_k \in \widetilde{G_P}$, $L(b_k)$ and $R(b_k)$ have the indices of the first and the second appearance of b_k in the $\mathcal{S}_{\widetilde{G_P}}$ respectively. Abusing notation, for any probe vertex $v \in B_k$, by $L(v)$ and $R(v)$ we will denote $L(b_k)$ and $R(b_k)$ respectively. We can obtain the look up tables in time $O(|P|)$ steps.

Definition 4.3. For any $w \in N$ and any block B_k, we say that B_k is a *block-neighbor* of w if there exists at least one vertex in B_k that is a neighbor of w. If all the vertices in B_k are neighbors of w, we call B_k a *full-block-neighbor* of w and if there exists at least one vertex in B_k that is a neighbor of w and at least one vertex of B_k that is not a neighbor of w we call it a *partial-block-neighbor* of w. Also for any $w \in N$ let us define the function $f_w : \{1, 2, \ldots, t\} \to \{0, 1, 2\}$ as

$$f_w(k) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } B_k \text{ is not a block-neighbor of } w; \\ 1, & \text{if } B_k \text{ is a full-block-neighbor of } w; \\ 2, & \text{if } B_k \text{ is a partial-block-neighbor of } w. \end{cases}$$

By abuse of notation, for any probe vertex $v \in B_k$ by $f_w(v)$ we will denote $f_w(k)$.

Note that for any $w_j \in N$ one can compute the function f_{w_j} in $O(d_j)$ number of steps and can store the function f_{w_j} in an array of size t.

4.2.1 Idea of the Algorithm

If G is PTPIG then from Condition (A) in Theorem 3.4 we can see that the following condition is a necessary (though not a sufficient) condition:

Condition B1: For all $1 \leq j \leq q$, there is a substring of $\mathcal{S}_{\widetilde{G_P}}$ where only the block-neighbors of w_j appear and all the block-neighbors of w_j appear at least once and any block that is not at the beginning or end of the substring must be a full-block-neighbor of w_j.

Though the above Condition B1 is not a sufficient condition, but as a first step we will check if the graph satisfies the Condition B1. For every $w_j \in N$, we will identify (using algorithm **CheckConditionB1(w_j)**) all possible maximal substrings of $\mathcal{S}_{G_P}$ that can satisfy Condition B1. If such a substring exists, then CheckConditionB1(w_j) outputs the block numbers that appear at the beginning and end of the substring. Let for some w_j, CheckConditionB1(w_j) outputs (k_1, k_2), then note that $1 \leq k_1 \leq k_2 \leq t$ and k_1 and k_2 are the only possible partial neighbors of w_j. The algorithm CheckConditionB1(w_j) is very similar to the algorithm **Testing Condition (A1)** that we described for the Step I, when we assumed G_P is a connected reduced proper interval graph.

Now as we mentioned earlier the Condition (B1) is not sufficient for G to be a PTPIG. For G to be a PTPIG (that is, to satisfy Condition (A) of Theorem 3.4) we will have to find a suitable canonical ordering of the vertices or in other words, by Remark 2.6, we need to find suitable ordering of vertices in each block. Depending on (k_1, k_2) which is the output by CheckConditionB1(w_j), we have a number of cases and for each of the cases some restrictions will be imposed on the ordering of the vertices within blocks.

Let $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_t$ be the ordering of the vertices of blocks $B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_t$ respectively. For every $w_j \in N$, let us denote by $Ngb_k(w_j)$, the vertices in the block B_k those are neighbors of w_j. We list the different cases and restriction on $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_t$ that would be imposed in each of the cases when the algorithm **CheckConditionB1(w_j)** outputs (k_1, k_2).

- **Category 0: There are no partial-block-neighbors of w_j.** In this case Condition (B1) is sufficient.
- **Category 1: There exists exactly one partial-block-neighbor of w_j.** Let k be the block that is a partial-block-neighbor of w_j. In this case we will have 4 subcategories:
  - **Category 1a: B_k is the only block-neighbor of w_j.** In that case, σ_k must ensure that the vertices in $Ngb_k(w_j)$ must be contiguous.
  - **Category 1b: All pairs returned by CheckConditionB1(w_j) is of the form (k, k_2) with $k_2 \neq k$.** In that case, σ_k must ensure that the vertices in $Ngb_k(w_j)$ must be contiguous and must be flushed to the Right.
  - **Category 1c: All pairs returned by CheckConditionB1(w_j) is of the form**

(k_1, k) **with** $k_1 \neq k$**.** In that case, σ_k must ensure that the vertices in $Ngb_k(w_j)$ must be contiguous and must be flushed to the Left.

- **Category 1d: All other cases.** In that case, CheckConditionB1(w_j) returns (k, k) or returns both (k, k_2) and (k_1, k). In both the cases σ_k must ensure that the vertices in $Ngb_k(w_j)$ must be contiguous and must either be flushed to the Left or to the Right.

- **Category 2: There exists exactly two partial-block-neighbor of** w_j**.** Let k_1, k_2 be the two blocks which are partial-block-neighbors of w_j. In this case we claim that the following three cases may happen:

  - **Category 2a:** $\{k_1, k_2\} = \{1, 2\}$ **and the** $\mathcal{S}_{\widetilde{G_P}}$ **begins with 121.** In this case the following two conditions must be satisfied:

    * **Condition 2a(1)** σ_1 must ensure that the vertices in $Ngb_1(w_j)$ are contiguous and must be either flushed to the Right or Left and σ_2 must ensure that the vertices in $Ngb_2(w_j)$ are contiguous and must be either flushed to the Right or Left.
    * **Condition 2a(2)** If the vertices in $Ngb_1(w_j)$ flushed to the Left then the vertices of $Ngb_2(w_j)$ must be flushed to Right and if the vertices in $Ngb_1(w_j)$ flushed to the Right then the vertices of $Ngb_2(w_j)$ must be flushed to the Left.

  - **Category 2b:** $\{k_1, k_2\} = \{t-1, t\}$ **and the** $\mathcal{S}_{\widetilde{G_P}}$ **ends with** $t(t-1)t$**.** Like the previous condition, both the following two conditions must satisfied:

    * **Condition 2b(1)** σ_{t-1} must ensure that the vertices in $Ngb_{t-1}(w_j)$ are contiguous and must be either flushed to the Right or Left and σ_t must ensure that the vertices in $Ngb_t(w_j)$ are contiguous and must be either flushed to the Right or Left.
    * **Condition 2b(2)** If the vertices in $Ngb_{t-1}(w_j)$ flushed to the Left then the vertices of $Ngb_t(w_j)$ must be flushed to Right and if the vertices in $Ngb_{t-1}(w_j)$ flushed to the Right then the vertices of $Ngb_t(w_j)$ must be flushed to Left

  - **Category 2c: CheckConditionB1(**w_j**) outputs** (k_1, k_2)**.** In this case (from Corollary 3.11) CheckConditionB1(w_j) cannot output both (k_1, k_2) and (k_2, k_1) unless in the Category 2a and 2b. Thus in this case σ_{k_1} must ensure that the vertices in $Ngb_{k_1}(w_j)$ are contiguous and is flushed to the Right and σ_{k_2} must ensure that the vertices in $Ngb_{k_2}(w_j)$ are contiguous and is flushed to the Left.

- **Category 3:** If for some w_j, there are more than 2 partial block neighbors then G cannot be a PTPIG.

Using algorithm CheckConditionB1(w_j) we can identify all the various kind of restrictions on $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_t$ those are necessary to be imposed so that G is a PTPIG. Note that if there exists $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_t$ such that the above restriction are satisfied for all w_j, then G is a PTPIG. So our goal is to check if there exists $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_t$ such that the above restriction are satisfied for all w_j.

For this we define a generalization of the consecutive 1's problem (we call it the oriented-consecutive 1's problem) and show how that can be used to store all the restrictions in the PQ-tree that already stores all the restrictions which are imposed by the fact that G_P is a proper interval graph. We will first show how to handle all the conditions except for the special conditions Condition 2a(2) for Category 2a and Condition 2b(2) for Category 2b. After we have successfully stored all the other restrictions we will show how to handle these special conditions.

Note that except for these special conditions all the restrictions are of the following four kinds:

- All the vertices in $Ngb_k(w_j)$ are consecutive and flushed to the left
- All the vertices in $Ngb_k(w_j)$ are consecutive and flushed to the Right.
- All the vertices in $Ngb_k(w_j)$ are consecutive and either flushed to the Left or flushed to the Right.
- All the vertices in $Ngb_k(w_j)$ are consecutive.

In the Section 4.2.2 we describe the Oriented-Consecutive 1's problem and show how that can be used to store all the above restrictions except for the special conditions mentioned above. The following Lemma shows how to handle the special conditions Condition 2a(2) for Category 2a and Condition 2b(2) for Category 2b.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_t$ be an ordering of blocks $B_1, \ldots, B_t$ in G such that for all $k = 1, 2, \ldots, t$ and for all $w_j \in N$, all the restrictions imposed by w_j on σ_k is satisfied, except for the special conditions Condition 2a(2) for Category 2a and Condition 2b(2) for Category 2b. If σ_k^r is denotes the reverse permutation of σ_k then we claim that one of the 16 possibilities obtained by reversing or not reversing the orderings $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_{t-1}$ and σ_t will be a valid ordering if G is PTPIG.*

Proof. Straightforward. □

So by the above lemma once we identify all the orderings $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_t$ that satisfies all the restrictions imposed by all $w_j \in N$ except for the special conditions Condition 2a(2) for Category 2a and Condition 2b(2) for Category 2b, we have to check if any of the 16 possibilities is a valid set of permutation.

4.2.2 Oriented-Consecutive 1's problem

Problem 4.5 (Oriented-Consecutive 1's problem)**. Input:** A set $\Omega = \{s_1 \ldots, s_m\}$ and n restrictions $(S_1, b_1), \ldots, (S_n, b_n)$ where $S_i \subseteq \Omega$ and $b_i \in \{-1, 0, 1, 2\}$.
Question: Is there a linear ordering of Ω, say, $s_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, s_{\sigma(m)}$ such that for $1 \leq i \leq n$ the following are satisfied:

- If $b_i = 0$, then all the elements in S_i are consecutive in the linear ordering.
- If $b_i = -1$, then all the element in S_i are consecutive in the linear ordering and all the elements of S_i are flushed towards Left, i.e., $s_{\sigma(1)} \in S_i$.
- If $b_i = 1$, then all the element in S_i are consecutive in the linear ordering and all the elements of S_i are flushed towards Right, i.e., $s_{\sigma(m)} \in S_i$.
- If $b_i = 2$, then all the element in S_i are consecutive in the linear ordering and all the elements of S_i are either flushed towards Left or flushed towards Right, i.e., either $s_{\sigma(1)} \in S_i$ or $s_{\sigma(m)} \in S_i$.

Now this problem is very similar to the consecutive 1's problem. The consecutive 1's problem is solved by using the PQ-tree. Recall the algorithm: given a set $\Omega = \{s_1, \ldots, s_m\}$ and a set of subsets of Ω, say, $S_1, \ldots, S_m$, the algorithm outputs a PQ tree T with leaves $\{s_1, \ldots, s_m\}$ and the property that $PQ(T)$ is the set of all orderings of Ω where for all S_i $(1 \leq i \leq m)$, the elements in S_i are contiguous. The algorithm has m iterations. The algorithms starts will a trivial PQ tree T and at the end of the k-th iteration the PQ tree T has the property that $PQ(T)$ is the set of all orderings of Ω where for all S_i $(1 \leq i \leq k-1)$, the elements in S_i are contiguous in the ordering. At iteration k, the PQ tree T is updated using the algorithm $Restrict(T, S_k)$[4][2]. If for some S_k, $Restrict(T, S_k)$ cannot be performed, the algorithm halts and rejects.

We will use similar technique to solve the Oriented-Consecutive 1's Problem. In fact we will reduce the Oriented-Consecutive 1's Problem to the standard Consecutive 1's Problem, but we will assume that all the restrictions of the form (S_i, b_i), where $b_i = 2$, appear at the end. That is, if for some i we have $b_i = 2$, then for all $j \geq i$ we will have $b_j = 2$. We present Algorithm 4 for solving the Oriented-Consecutive 1's Problem and the following result proves that the correctness of the algorithm.

[2]In [4] they define the update algorithm as $Reduce(T, S)$. In this paper we use the name $Restrict(T, S)$ instead of $Reduce(T, S)$ as we think that the word "Restrict" is more suitable.

Claim 4.6. *If we assume that $b_i = 2$ implies $b_j = 2$ for all $j \geq i$, then Algorithm 4 is a correct algorithm for the Oriented-Consecutive 1's Problem. In fact all the valid ordering are stored in the PQ-tree T.*

Proof. First let us assume that $b_i \neq 2$ for all i. We initialize the PQ-tree with $\Omega \cup \{\vdash, \dashv\}$ as leaves. Then we use Restrict$(T, \Omega \cup \{\vdash\})$ and Restrict$(T, \Omega \cup \{\dashv\})$ this implies that any ordering of the σ of $\Omega \cup \{\vdash, \dashv\}$ must have $\vdash$ and $\dashv$ at the two ends. Note that if σ is infact a valid ordering of the elements in $\Omega \cup \{\vdash, \dashv\}$ that satisfies all the constraints then the reverse of σ is also a valid ordering of the elements in $\Omega \cup \{\vdash, \dashv\}$ that satisfies all the constraints. So we can always assume that $\vdash$ is in the beginning (i.e., the leftmost position) and $\dashv$ is at the end (i.e., the rightmost position).

From now on, if we say the elements of the set S_i is flushed to the Left we would mean that $S_i \cup \{\vdash\}$ is contiguous. Similarly if we say the elements of the set S_i is flushed to the Right we would mean that $S_i \cup \{\dashv\}$ is contiguous. Now let us check case by case basis:

Case 1: $b_j = 0$. Then by using Restrict(T, S_j) we ensure that all the elements in S_j are contiguous in the ordering.

Case 2: $b_j = -1$. Then by using Restrict$(T, S_j \cup \{\vdash\})$ we ensure that all the elements in $S_j \cup \{\vdash\}$ are contiguous in the ordering and since $\vdash$ is at the leftmost position so that means the elements in S_j are contiguous and flushed to the Left.

Case 3: $b_j = 1$. Then by using Restrict$(T, S_j \cup \{\dashv\})$ we ensure that all the elements in $S_j \cup \{\dashv\}$ are contiguous in the ordering and since $\dashv$ is at the rightmost position so that means the elements in S_j are contiguous and flushed to the Right.

So if $b_i \neq 2$ for all i, then the algorithm solves the Oriented-Consecutive 1's Problem correctly.

Now let us assume that there exists i such that for all $j \geq i$, $b_j = 2$ and for all $j < i$, $b_j \neq 2$. First consider the case that there exists an $i' \leq i$ such that $b_{i'} = 1$. So at the i^{th} iteration of the algorithm, the permutation σ that satisfies the PQ-tree ensures that the elements in $S_{i'}$ is flushed to the Right. Now at the i^{th} iteration, the algorithm ORestrict$(T, S_i \cup \{\vdash, \dashv\})$ first checks that whether S_i can be flushed to the Right or S_i can be flushed to the Left. By Lemma 4.7 we note either S_i can be flushed Left or can be flushed Right. In other words there is no choice and the algorithm will find that option. Similar argument will hold if there exists a $i' \leq i$ such that $b_{i'} = -1$.

Now the complement of the above two cases is that for all i, b_i is either 0 or 2. In this case, note that if σ is a permutation that satisfies the conditions, then the reverse of permutation σ^r will also satisfy the conditions. Now if for some i, $b_i = 2$ and we flushed S_i to Left. By Lemma 4.7 if $b_j = 2$ for all the $j > i$, only one option is possible. Now instead of flushing S_i to Left if we had flushed S_i to Right we would be getting the reverse permutations. □

Algorithm 3: ORestrict$(T, S, \{a, b\})$

Input : PQ-tree T on set Ω, set $S \subset \Omega$, $\{a, b\}$
Output : PQ-Tree

```
if Restrict(T, S ∪ {a}) is possible then
    Restrict(T, S ∪ {a})
else
    Restrict(T, S ∪ {b})
```

Algorithm 4: Oriented-Consecutive 1's test

Input : Ω, $(S_1, b_1), \ldots, (S_n, b_n)$
Output : A PQ-tree T over the universe Ω such that all the remaining orderings satisfy the restrictions (S_j, b_j)

```
Initialize PQ-tree T with Ω ∪ {⊢, ⊣} as leaves attached to the root (which is a P-node)
Restrict(T, Ω ∪ {⊢});
Restrict(T, Ω ∪ {⊣});
for j ← 1 to t do
    if b_j = 0 then
        Restrict(T, S_j);
    if b_j = −1 then
        Restrict(T, S_j ∪ {⊢});
    if b_j = 1 then
        Restrict(T, S_j ∪ {⊣});
    if b_j = 2 then
        ORestrict(T, S_j ∪ {⊢, ⊣});
```

Lemma 4.7. *Let $\Omega = \{s_1, \ldots, s_m\}$ and $S_1, S_2 \subset \Omega$. Then the following two conditions cannot happen simultaneously:*

1. *There is an ordering of elements of Ω such that the elements of S_1 and S_2 are flushed Left.*
2. *There is an ordering of elements of Ω such that the elements of S_1 are flushed Left while the elements of S_2 are flushed Right.*

Proof. Let σ be an ordering of the elements of Ω such that the elements of both S_1 and S_2 are flushed Left. This can happen only if either $S_1 \subseteq S_2$ or $S_2 \subseteq S_1$. Similarly, if σ' be an ordering of the elements of Ω such that the elements of S_1 are flushed Left and S_2 are flushed Right. This can happen only if either $(S_2) \subseteq (S_1)^c$ or $(S_1)^c \subseteq S_2$, where $(S_1)^c$ is the complement of set S_1. Note that both the conditions, that is "either $S_1 \subseteq S_2$ or $S_2 \subseteq S_1$" and "either $(S_2) \subseteq (S_1)^c$ or $(S_1)^c \subseteq S_2$" cannot happen simultaneously. □

Algorithm 5: Finding-1-2-Subsequence

Input : An array $A[1,T]$ containing only 0/1/2 entries, d (Assume $A[T+1]=0$).

Output : Output all (s,t) pairs such that $(t-s+1)\geq d$ and for all $s<i<t$, $A[i]=1$, $A[s],A[t]\in\{1,2\}$, (either $s=1$ or $A[s-1]=0$ or $A[s-1]=A[s]=2$) and (either $t=T$ or $A[t+1]=0$ or $A[t]=A[t+1]=2$).

Initialize $\ell=r=0$ **while** $r\leq T$ **do**
  if $A[r+1]=0$ **then**
    if $r-\ell\geq d$ **then**
      Output $(\ell+1,r)$
    $\ell=r+1$; $r=r+1$
  if $A[r+1]=1$ **then**
    $r=r+1$
  if $A[r+1]=2$ **then**
    if $A[r]=1$ **then**
      if $r+1-\ell\geq d$ **then**
        Output $(\ell+1,r+1)$
      $\ell=r$; $r=r+1$
    if $A[r]\neq 1$ **then**
      $\ell=r$; $r=r+1$

Algorithm 6: CheckConditionB1(w_j)

Input : Given a graph $G=(P,N,E)$, $w_j\in N$. **(For f_{w_j} refer to Definition 4.3).**

Output : Accept if the **Condition B1** is satisfied for the vertex w_j.

Initialize two arrays X and Y of length $4d_j+1$ by setting all the entries to 0.
Let $\ell=L(A_j[1])$ and $r=R(A_j[1])$.
for *each* $k\leftarrow 1$ **to** d_j **do**
  Let $s=L(A_j[k])$ and $t=R(A_j[k])$
  If $(\ell-2d_j\leq s\leq\ell+2d_j)$ **Mark** $X[s-\ell+2d_j+1]=f_{w_j}(A_j[k])$
  If $(\ell-2d_j\leq t\leq\ell+2d_j)$ **Mark** $X[t-\ell+2d_j+1]=f_{w_j}(A_j[k])$
  If $(r-2d_j\leq s\leq r+2d_i)$ **Mark** $Y[s-r+2d_j+1]=f_{w_j}(A_j[k])$
  If $(r-2d_j\leq t\leq r+2d_j)$ **Mark** $Y[t-r+2d_j+1]=f_{w_j}(A_j[k])$
for *all* (a,b) *output of* ***Find-1-2-Subsequence***(X,d_j) **do**
  Let $\hat{a}=a+\ell-2d_j-1$ and $\hat{b}=b+\ell-2d_j-1$.
  if $\forall 1\leq k\leq d_j$ *Either* $\hat{a}\leq L(A_j[k])\leq\hat{b}$ *OR* $\hat{a}\leq R(A_j[k])\leq\hat{b}$ **then**
    Return(k_1,k_2) such that (Either $L(b_{k_1})=\hat{a}$ OR $R(b_{k_1})=\hat{a}$) AND (Either $L(b_{k_2})=\hat{b}$ OR $R(b_{k_2})=\hat{b}$)
for *all* (a,b) *output of* ***Find-1-2-Subsequence***(Y,d_j) **do**
  Let $\hat{a}=a+r-2d_j-1$ and $\hat{b}=b+r-2d_j-1$.
  if $\forall 1\leq k\leq d_j$ *Either* $\hat{a}\leq L(A_j[k])\leq\hat{b}$ *OR* $\hat{a}\leq R(A_j[k])\leq\hat{b}$ **then**
    Return(k_1,k_2) such that (Either $L(b_{k_1})=\hat{a}$ OR $R(b_{k_1})=\hat{a}$) AND (Either $L(b_{k_2})=\hat{b}$ OR $R(b_{k_2})=\hat{b}$)
If nothing is returned then **REJECT**

Algorithm 7: Testing if G is PTPIG

Input : Given a graph $G = (P, N, E)$

Output: Accept if G is a PTPIG

for $k \leftarrow 1$ **to** t **do**
  Initialize PQ-tree T_k with $B_k \cup \{\vdash, \dashv\}$ as leaves attached to the root (which is a P-node)
  Restrict($T_k, B_k \cup \{\vdash\}$); Restrict($T_k, B_k \cup \{\dashv\}$);
for $j \leftarrow 1$ **to** q **do**
  if *Condition B1 is satisfied by node* w_j **then**
    if *Number of Partial-Block Neighbors of* w_j *is 0* **then**
      $j = j + 1$
    if *Number of Partial-Block-Neighbors of* w_j *is 1 (let* B_k *be the partial-block-neighbor)* **then**
      if *Number of Block-Neighbors of* w_j *is* 1 **then**
        Restrict($T_k, Ngb_k(w_j)$); $j = j + 1$
      if *All pairs returned by* $CheckConditionB1(w_j)$ *are of the form* (k, k_2) *with* $k_2 \neq k$ **then**
        Restrict($T_k, Ngb_k(w_j) \cup \vdash$); $j = j + 1$
      if *All pairs returned by* $CheckConditionB1(w_j)$ *are of the form* (k_1, k) *with* $k_1 \neq k$ **then**
        Restrict($T_k, Ngb_k(w_j) \cup \dashv$); $j = j + 1$
      else
        ORestrict($T_k, Ngb_k(w_j)$, $\{\vdash, \dashv\}$); $j = j + 1$
    if *Number of Block Neighbors of* w_j *is 2 (let* B_{k_1}, B_{k_2} *be the partial-block-neighbors)* **then**
      if $(\{k_1, k_2\} = \{1, 2\}$ & $\mathcal{S}_{\widetilde{G_P}}$ *starts with* 121) ***Or*** $(\{k_1, k_2\} = \{t-1, t\}$ & $\mathcal{S}_{\widetilde{G_P}}$ *ends with* $t(t-1)t)$ **then**
        ORestrict($T_{k_1}, Ngb_{k_1}(w_j), \{\vdash, \dashv\}$); ORestrict($T_{k_2}, Ngb_{k_2}(w_j), \{\vdash, \dashv\}$); $j = j + 1$
      else
        Let $CheckConditionB1(w_j)$ returns (k_1, k_2)
        Restrict($T_{k_1}, Ngb_{k_1}(w_j) \cup \{\vdash\}$); Restrict($T_{k_2}, Ngb_{k_2}(w_j) \cup \{\dashv\}$); $j = j + 1$
    if *Number of Block Neighbors of* w_j *is* ≥ 3 **then**
      REJECT
Let $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_t$ be permutations satisfying the PQ-trees $T_1, \ldots, T_t$.
if $\overline{\sigma_1}, \overline{\sigma_2}, \ldots, \overline{\sigma_{t-1}}, \overline{\sigma_t}$ *satisfies Condition (A) of Theorem 3.4, where* $\overline{\sigma_s} = \sigma_s$ *or,* σ_s^r *for* $s = 1, 2, t-1, t$ **then**
  ACCEPT
else
  REJECT

4.2.3 The algorithm

The Algorithm 6 ckecks if for a given $w_j \in N$ the Condition (B1) is satisfied. The algorithm is similar to the one in Step I where we assumed that the graph G_P is a connected reduced proper interval graph. Once we have the Algorithm 6 for checking if the graph satisfies Condition (B1) for every $w_j \in N$, the Algorithm 7 checks whether the graph $G = (P, N, E)$ is a PTPIG. In the following theorem we prove the correctness of the algorithm.

Theorem 4.8. *Given graph $G = (P, N, E)$ such that G_P is a connected proper interval graph, the Algorithm 7 correctly decides whether G is a PTPIG with probes P and nonprobes N in time $O(|P| + |N| + |E_2|)$, where E_2 is the set of edges between probes P and nonprobes N.*

Proof. We follow notations, terminologies and ideas developed in the beginning of Step II and in the 'Idea of the Algorithm'. In Lines 1–3 of Algorithm 7, we fix the markers $\dashv$ and $\vdash$ at the beginning and end of each block B_k respectively, $k = 1, 2, \ldots, t$. Then for each $j = 1, 2, \ldots, q$, we run the algorithm. First, in Line 5, we check Condition B1 for w_j by Algorithm 6 which takes a help from Algorithm 5. Both algorithms are similar to Algorithm 2 and 1. The difference is that Algorithm 6 not only ensures that the graph G satisfies Condition B1 for vertex $w_j \in N$ but also return (k_1, k_2) where k_1 and k_2 are the index of the start and end block of the substring that helps to satisfy the Condition B1. It also ensure that no block in between k_1 and k_2 is a partial block neighbor of w_j. If w_j has more than two partial-block neighbors, the Algorithm rejects.

Now in Lines 6–24, Algorithm 7 uses the ideas developed for Algorithm 4 for Oriented-consecutive 1's problem to apply all the necessary restrictions on the orderings of vertices in each block, as described in Section 4.2.1, except for the special conditions Condition 2a(2) for Category 2a and Condition 2b(2) for Category 2b. Here we assume that all the calls to *ORestrict* is done at the very end. This can be done by having two passes over the graph. Once we make all the calls to *ORestrict* at the very end by Claim 4.6, we get the correctness of the algorithm so far.

Finally for checking whether special conditions Condition 2a(2) for Category 2a and Condition 2b(2) for Category 2b are satisfied, we require Lines 17-19 and 25-26. Suppose w_j falls under Category 2a and both B_1 and B_2 are partial-block-neighbors of w_j. Then Algorithm 6 returns both $(1, 2)$ and $(2, 1)$. Note that we have already ensure that both $Ngb_1(w_j)$ and $Ngb_2(w_j)$ are either flushed Left or Right. If for some other $w_{j'}$ we have already flushed $Ngb_1(w_{j'})$ Left or Right then by Lemma 4.7 we had only one option when we were flushing $Ngb_1(w_j)$ to Left or Right. If for no other $w_{j'}$ we have already flushed $Ngb_1(w_{j'})$ Left or Right then we can consider either σ_1 or σ_1^r. The same argument holds for σ_2, σ_t and σ_{t-1}. Thus if we check for all possibilities for σ_i or σ_i^r,

$i = 1, 2, t, t-1$ (as in Lines 25-26 of Algorithm 7) we can correctly decide whether G is a PTPIG with probes P and nonprobes N.

Now we compute the running time. The total running time of Algorithm 6 (including the formation of look up tables and the function $f_{n_i}(j)$ is $O(|P| + |E_2|)$ as before, where E_2 is the set of edges between probes P and nonprobes N). The variation of PQ-tree algorithm used in Lines 10, 12, 14, 16, 19 and 22 requires $O(|P| + |N| + |E_2|)$ as it requires for normal PQ-tree algorithm. The Line 26 requires constant times of $|E_2|$ steps for 4 blocks, namely, B_1, B_2, B_{t-1} and B_t where σ_s or σ_s^r $(s = 1, 2, t-1, t)$ is required if the special cases Category 2a or 2b occur. Thus the total running time is $O(|P| + |N| + |E_2|)$. □

4.3 Step III: The graph G_P is a proper interval graph (not necessarily connected or reduced)

Finally, we consider the graph $G = (V, E)$ with an independent set N (nonprobes) and $P = V \setminus N$ (probes) such that G_P is a proper interval graph, which may not be connected. Suppose G_P has r connected components $G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_r$ with vertex sets $P_1, \ldots, P_r$. For G to be a PTPIG, it is essential that the subgraphs of G induced by $P_k \cup N$ is a PTPIG for each $k = 1, 2, \ldots, r$. As we have seen in the last subsection we can check if all the subgraphs are PTPIG in time $O(|V| + |E|)$. In fact, for each k, we can store all the possible canonical orderings of vertices in P_k such that the corresponding canonical sequence satisfies the Condition (A) of Theorem 3.4 so that the graph induced by $P_k \cup N$ is a PTPIG.

For any vertex $w_j \in N$, let us call G_k a *component-neighbor* of w_j if there is a vertex in P_k that is adjacent to w_j. G_k is called a *full-component-neighbor* of w_j if all the vertices in P_k are neighbors of w_j. Also G_k is called a *partial-component-neighbor* of w_j if there exists at least one vertex in P_k that is a neighbor of w_j and at least one vertex in P_k that is not a neighbor of w_j.

We will just be presenting the idea of the algorithm. The steps of the algorithm is obvious from the description given. We will be using all the algorithm developed so far in the previous sections for this recognition algorithm.

4.3.1 Idea of the algorithm

To check if the whole graph G is a PTPIG we have to find if there exists a canonical ordering of all the vertices in G_P such that for the whole graph the Condition (A) of Theorem 3.4 is satisfied. Note that a canonical ordering of the vertices of G_P would place the vertices in each connected

component next to each other and moreover for each k, the ordering of the vertices of G_k would be a canonical ordering for the graph G_k. So to check if G is a PTPIG we have to find if there exist an ordering of the connected components and canonical ordering of vertices in each of the components such that the corresponding canonical ordering satisfies the Condition (A) of Theorem 3.4. In fact G is a PTPIG if and only if the following condition is satisfied:

Condition (C1): There exists a permutation $\pi : \{1, \ldots, r\} \to \{1, \ldots, r\}$ and canonical sequences $\mathcal{S}_{G_1}, \ldots, \mathcal{S}_{G_r}$ of $G_1, \ldots, G_r$ such that the canonical sequence $\mathcal{S}_{G_P}$ of G_P obtained by concatenation of the canonical sequences of $G_{\pi(1)}, \ldots, G_{\pi(r)}$ (that is, $\mathcal{S}_{G_P} = \mathcal{S}_{G_{\pi(1)}} \ldots \mathcal{S}_{G_{\pi(r)}}$) has the property that for all $w \in N$, there exists a *perfect substring* of w in $\mathcal{S}_{G_P}$ (that is, there exists a substring of $\mathcal{S}_{G_P}$ where only the vertices of w appear and all the neighbors of w appears at least once).

Firstly we will use our previous algorithms to store all the possible canonical orderings of the vertices in each component so that the graphs induced by $G_k \cup N$ is a PTPIG, for each k. As usual we will store the restrictions using the PQ-tree. Next we will have to add some more restrictions on the canonical ordering of the vertices in each of the connected components which are necessary for the graph G to be a PTPIG. These restriction will be be stored in the same the PQ-tree. At last we check if there exists an ordering of the components such that the corresponding canonical ordering satisfies the Condition (A) of Theorem 3.4.

Now to find the extra restrictions on the canonical ordering we have to place we will look at several cases depending on how many partial-component neighbors are there for each $w_j \in N$. The main idea is that the following is a necessary condition for the above Condition (C1) to be satisfied:

Condition (C2): If vertex w_j has more than one component-neighbors, then for any component G_k the canonical ordering of the vertices in G_k should ensure that not only there is a perfect substring of w_j in $\mathcal{S}_{G_k}$, but also a perfect substring of w_j must be present either at the beginning or at the end of $\mathcal{S}_{G_k}$.

Depending on how many partial-component-neighbors are there for each $w_j \in N$ and the number of blocks in each of the partial component we list the restrictions on the canonical ordering of the vertices in each component so the Condition (C2) is satisfied. Here we will also use the notion of block-neighbor as defined in the previous section.

- (Case 1): w_j has only one component neighbor. In this case there are no extra restrictions.
- (Case 2): w_j has no partial-component neighbors. In this case there are no extra restrictions.

- (Case 3): w_j has more than two partial-component-neighbors. In this case the graph G cannot be a PTPIG.
- (Case 4): w_j has more than one component neighbors and in one of the component neighbor there are 2 or more partial-block-neighbors. In this case the graph G cannot be a PTPIG.
- (Case 5): w_j has more than one component neighbors and let G_k be a partial-component neighbor of w_j. In this case we have two cases depending on the arrangement of blocks of G_k:
  - (Case 5a): If G_k has only one block. Then we have to add the restriction that in the canonical ordering of the vertices in G_k the neighbors of w_j must be either flushed Left or flushed Right. If the component G_k is a partial-component-neighbor of more than one nonprobe vertex then by Lemma 4.7, the choice of whether to flush Left or Right is fixed.
  - (Case 5b): If G_k has more than one blocks and at least one of the block (say B_s^k) is a partial-block-neighbor of w_j. By Corollary 3.10 and Corollary 3.11 we see that there is at most one direction (Left or Right) to flush the neighbors of w_j in B_s^k so that in the corresponding canonical sequence there is a perfect-substring of w_j either at the beginning or the end.

Note that one can easily identify the cases above and apply the necessary restrictions on the orderings using the PQ-tree and the same techniques as developed for the Oriented-consecutive 1's Problem in Section 4.2.2. If after applying the restriction we see that Condition (C2) is not satisfied, we know that G is not a PTPIG. All this can be done in time $O(|V| + |E|)$.

Once we have been able to apply the restriction and ensure that the Condition (C2) is satisfied we now need to check if there exits an ordering of the components so that Condition (C1) is satisfied. For any $w_j \in N$ and any connected component G_k, if G_k is a component-neighbor of w_j then we know whether the perfect substring of w_j is at the beginning or end of the canonical sequence of G_k. If the perfect substring of w_j is at the beginning of the canonical sequence of G_k we will call w_j *left-oriented* with respect to G_k and if the perfect substring of w_j is at the end of the canonical sequence of G_k we will call w_j *right-oriented* with respect to G_k.

The problem now is to check if there exists an ordering of the connected components such that for any $w_j \in N$ the following conditions are satisfied:

1. the component-neighbors of w_j must be consecutive,

2. there exist at most one of the component-neighbors G_k of w_j such that w_j is right-oriented with respect to G_k and this component-neighbor is first component-neighbor of w_j in the ordering,

3. there exist at most one of the component-neighbors G_k of w_j such that w_j is left-oriented with respect to G_k and this component-neighbor is last component-neighbor of w_j in the ordering.

This problem can be reduced to a consecutive 1's problem: Let $\Omega = \cup_{k=1}^{r}\{\vdash_k, \dashv_k\}$. For any $w_j \in N$ let us define the set T_j as follows:

- if G_k is a full-component neighbor of w_j the T_j contains $\vdash_k$ and $\dashv_k$
- if G_k is a partial-component-neighbor of w_j and w_j is right-oriented with respect to B_k then T_j contains $\dashv_k$
- if G_k is a partial-component-neighbor of w_j and w_j is left-oriented with respect to B_k then T_j contains $\vdash_k$

Now G is a PTPIG if and only if there exists a permutation of Ω that satisfies the following properties:

- For all k, $\{\vdash_k, \dashv_k\}$ are next to each other.
- For all $w_j \in N$, the elements in T_j must be consecutive.

Note that the above can be tested easily using the PQ-tree in time linear in $|V|$ and $|E|$ and with this we have the complete recognition algorithm for PTPIG.

5 Conclusion

The study of interval graphs was spearheaded by Benzer [2] in his studies in the field of molecular biology. In [37], Zhang introduced a generalization of interval graphs called probe interval graphs (PIG) in an attempt to aid a problem called cosmid contig mapping. In order to obtain a better model another generalization of interval graphs were introduced that capture the property of overlap information, namely tagged probe interval graphs (TPIG) by Sheng, Wang and Zhang in [34]. Still there is no recognition algorithm for TPIG, in general.

In this paper we characterize and obtain linear time recognition algorithm for a special class of TPIG, namely proper tagged probe interval graphs (PTPIG). The problem of obtaining a recognition algorithm for TPIG, in general is challenging and open till date. It is well known that an interval graph is a proper interval graph if and only if it does not contain $K_{1,3}$ as an induced subgraph of it. Similar forbidden subgraph characterization for PTPIG is another interesting problem.

References

[1] Asim. Basu, Sandip Das, Shamik Ghosh and Malay Sen, *Circular-arc bigraphs and its subclasses*, J. Graph Theory **73** (2013), 361 376.

[2] S. Benzer, *On the topology of the genetic fine structure*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA **45** (1959), 1607–1620.

[3] K. S. Booth and G. S. Leuker, *Linear algorithm to recognize interval grapha and test for the consecutive ones property*, Proc. 7th ACM Symp. Theory of computing, (1975), 255–265.

[4] K. S. Booth and G. S. Leuker, *Testing for the consecutive ones property, interval graphs and graph planarity using PQ-tree algorithms*, J. Comput. System Sci., **13** (1976), 335–379.

[5] D. E. Brown, *Variations on interval graphs*, Ph.D. Thesis, Univ. of Colorado at Denver, USA, 2004.

[6] D.G. Corneil, *A simple 3-sweep LBFS algorithm for the recognition of unit interval graphs*, Discrete Appl. Math. **138** (2004) 371 - 379.

[7] D.G. Corneil, S. Olariu, L. Stewart, *The LBFS structure and recognition of interval graphs*, in preparation; extended abstract appeared as The ultimate interval graph recognition algorithm?, in: Proceedings of SODA 98, Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, San Francisco, CA, USA, 1998, pp. 175–180.

[8] D.G. Corneil, S. Olariu, L. Stewart, *The LBFS structure and recognition of interval graphs*, SIAM J. Discrete Math., 23 (2010), 19051953.

[9] X. Deng, P. Hell and J. Huang, *Linear time representation algorithms for proper circular arc graphs and proper interval graphs*, SIAM J. Comput. **25** (1996) 390–403.

[10] C.M.H. de Figueiredo, J. Meidanis and C.P. de Mello, *A linear-time algorithm for proper interval graph recognition* Inform. Process. Lett. **56** (1995) 179–184.

[11] Shamik Ghosh, Maitry Podder and Malay Sen, *Adjacency matrices of probe interval graphs*, Discrete Appl. Math. **158** (2010) 2004–2013.

[12] M. C. Golumbic, Algorithmic graph theory and perfect graphs, Annals of Disc. Math., **57**, Elsevier Sci., USA, 2004.

[13] M. C. Golumbic and A. Trenk, *Tolerence Graphs*, Cambridge studies in advanced mathematics, Cambridge University Press, 2004.

[14] M. Habib, R. McConnel, C. Paul and L. Viennot, *Lex-BFS and partition refinement, with applications to transitive orientation, interval graph recognition, and consecutive ones testing*, Theor. Comput. Sci. **234** (2000) 59-84.

[15] Pavol Hell and Jing Huang, *Certifying LexBFS Recognition Algorithms for Proper Interval Graphs and Proper Interval Bigraphs*, SIAM J. Discret. Math. **18** (2005) 554–570.

[16] P. Hell, R. Shamir and R. Sharan, *A fully dynamic algorithm for recognizing and representing proper interval graphs*, SIAM J. Comput. **31** (2001) 289–305.

[17] Wen-Lian Hsu, *A Simple Test for the Consecutive Ones Property*, J. Algorithms, **43** (2002), 1–16.

[18] J. Johnson and J. Spinrad, *A polynomial time recognition algorithm for probe interval graphs*, Proc. 12th annual ACM - SIAM Symposium on Disc. Algorithms, Washington D.C., 2001.

[19] D. S. Malik, M. K. Sen and S. Ghosh, Introduction to Graph Theory, Cengage Learning, New York, 2014.

[20] R. M. McConnell, Y. Nussbaum, Linear-time recognition of probe interval graphs, in: A. Fiat, P. Sanders (Eds.), ESA 2009, in: LNCS, vol. 5757, Springer, Heidelberg, 2009, pp. 349–360. Full version available at: arXiv:1307.5547 [cs.DS].

[21] R. M. McConnel and J. P. Spinrad, *Construction of probe interval models*, SODA 02 Proceedings of the thirteenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms, (2002) 866–875.

[22] Terry A. McKee and F. R. McMorris, *Topics in intersection graph theory*, Siam Monographs on Discrete Mathematics and Applications, Philadelphia, 1999.

[23] F. McMorris, C. Wang and P. Zhang, *On probe interval graphs*, Disc. App. Math., **88** (1998), 315–324.

[24] J. Meidanis, O. Porto, G. P. Telles, *On the consecutive ones property*, Disc. App. Math. **88** (1998), 325-354.

[25] Yahav Nussbaum, *Recognition of probe proper interval graphs*, Discrete Applied Mathematics, **167** (2014), 228–238.

[26] H.-J. Pan, Partitioned probe proper interval graphs. Masters Thesis, National Chung Cheng University, Taiwan, 2008.

[27] F.S. Roberts, Representations of indifference relations, Ph. D. Thesis, Stanford Univeristy, 1968.

[28] F.S. Roberts, Indifference graphs, in: F. Harary (Ed.), Proof Techniques in Graph Theory, Academic Press, New York, 1969, pp. 139–146.

[29] F.S. Roberts, *On the compatibility between a graph and a simple order*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B **11** (1971) 28–38.

[30] F.S. Roberts, *Some applications of graph theory*, Chapter in book *Combinatorial and Computational Mathematics*, Published by World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd.

[31] M. Sen, S. Das, A. B. Roy and D. B. West, *Interval digraphs: An analogue of interval graphs*, J Graph Theory **13** (1989), 189–202.

[32] M. Sen, S. Das, and D. B. West, *Circular-arc digraphs: a characterization*, J. Graph Theory, **13** (1989), 581–592.

[33] L. Sheng, *Cycle free probe interval graphs*, Congressus Numerantium, **140** (1999), 33–42.

[34] L. Sheng, C. Wang and P. Zhang *Tagged probe interval graphs*, J. Combinatorial optimization, **5** (2001), 133–142.

[35] L. Sheng, C. Wang and P. Zhang *On the Perfectness of Tagged Probe Interval Graphs (with Chi Wang, Peisen Zhang*, Discrete Mathematical Problems with Medical Applications, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 159–163, 2000.

[36] L. Sheng, C. Wang and P. Zhang *Tagged probe interval graphs*, DIMACS Technical Report 98-12, 1998.

[37] P. Zhang, *Probe interval graphs and their application to physical mapping of DNA*, Manuscript, 1994.